

APR 31 1918  

---

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

---

THE  
**LUTHERAN QUARTERLY**

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

VOL. XLVIII—NO. 2.

---

APRIL, 1918.

---

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.  
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT  
1918

## CONTENTS

<b>I. French Estimates of Luther.....</b>	<b>169</b>
By L. H. Humphrey.	
<b>II. George Washington .....</b>	<b>202</b>
By Hon. Louis D. Fairfield.	
<b>III. The Principles of the Reformation and Their Relation to Modern Missions .....</b>	<b>210</b>
By Rev. L. B. Wolf, D.D.	
<b>IV. Anticipations of Christian Theology in the Writings of Heathen and Jewish Philosophers.....</b>	<b>222</b>
By Professor J. M. Hantz.	
<b>V. Scientific Theories that Challenge Faith.....</b>	<b>240</b>
By Professor L. S. Keyser, D.D.	
<b>VI. The Theology of Joseph Fort Newton.....</b>	<b>259</b>
By Paul Harold Heisey, B.D., A.M.	
<b>VII. The Centenary of the General Synod.....</b>	<b>271</b>
By W. H. Dunbar, D.D.	
<b>VIII. Current Theological Thought .....</b>	<b>275</b>
By Professor J. A. Singmaster, D.D.	
<b>IX. Review of Recent Literature.....</b>	<b>285</b>
The Holy Trinity—Introduction to the New Testament—The Record of a Quaker Conscience—Jesus on His Second Coming— The Master Quest—The Call to Arms—Confessions of a Brown- ing Lover—The Consciousness of Jesus—The Book of Revelations Not a Mystery—Letters on the Atonement—Lehrbuch der Kirch- engeschichte—Christliche Dogmatik—Outline Studies in Christian Doctrine—Life of Dr. Martin Luther—My Church—The Cross and the Crescent—Stories for Children—The Schoolmaster and His Son—The Three Kings—Luther's Picture—Tyndale's New Testa- ment—Documentary Sketch of the Reformation.	

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL 1918.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### FRENCH ESTIMATES OF LUTHER.

BY L. H. HUMPHREY.

CONTEMPORARY.

Morley, in his *Life of Voltaire*, refers to the great historical principle that "the actions and opinions of men in each generation are affected by something at work underneath, a moving current on whose flood they are borne." These currents have ebbed and flowed in French history for four centuries, since the time of Luther, producing a constantly changing attitude in the minds of men toward Luther and the principles of the Reformation. To follow these changes and some of their underlying causes, briefly, is the purpose of this article.

Two great movements toward liberty of thought and away from authority and dogmatic tradition, the Reformation and the Renaissance, were the dominant forces of the 16th century in France. The Renaissance ap-

Note.—The writer wishes to acknowledge the kind suggestions and assistance of Dr. Preserved Smith, author of "The Life and Letters of Luther," etc.

peared first, with its love of learning, including the study of Latin and Greek, the invention of printing, the promotion of the liberal arts and the renewal of the life of the spirit. It thus prepared the way for the Reformation. The two movements were allies for a time and then sharply separated. Luther was contemporary with the high Renaissance in France.

The Renaissance came from the South, reviving the pagan past of Greece and Rome—Heine's "Greek light-heartedness." It was chiefly intellectual and was easily indifferent and sceptical in politics as well as religion. In its return to nature, its philosophic freedom of thought and its independent morals, it was often in direct opposition to Christianity. Its influence was almost entirely confined to the upper classes.

The Reformation was a product of the North. It was distinctly a religious movement, an act of faith more than a reaching out for liberty, but in maintaining that the Bible and not the Church was the ultimate authority, it claimed the right of private judgment and in seeking freedom of conscience opened the way to freedom of thought and intellectual liberty. As religion was an affair of state, the Reformation was necessarily in opposition to the ruling classes, but it touched the common people and satisfied some of their deepest needs. In France, however, at the beginning, some of the nobility were influenced, to a certain degree, by Protestantism, and a little later, nobles like Coligny and Berquin became sincere Protestants. That the two movements were not entirely incompatible is shown in lives like Margaret of Navarre's, a child of both, or, as some one has said, "a combination of Rabelais and Calvin."

At the beginning of the 16th century the Church in France stood in need of the same reform movement that was sweeping over other parts of Europe. Ecclesiastical positions had been dispensed as rewards for secular service to unqualified candidates. As a result the clergy were completely demoralized. Superstition, impiety,



simony and immorality prevailed everywhere. A few earnest men had protested at intervals against this corruption, but there had been no sustained movement against it.

The Reformation began with a small group of Humanists, led by Jacques Lefèvre, who gathered round Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux, and Margaret of Navarre. Influenced by Luther, but more directly by Erasmus, they hoped to bring about a reformation within the Church without loud agitation, by a study of the Bible, sincere Christian living and the enlightening influence of the New Learning. Their efforts had no wide result. In 1512, five years before Luther posted his theses at Wittenburg, Lefèvre had published his Commentaries on St. Paul which clearly stated the principles of justification by faith and the authority of the Bible, but his words reached only a small audience of scholars. These Commentaries were read and approved by Luther who called Lefèvre a "pillar of erudition and integrity." He in return counted Luther among those whom he "cherished in Christ." Later they differed on policy, as Lefèvre, fearing persecution, was irresolute in proclaiming the ideas of the Reformation. He regretted his lack of boldness shortly before his death. His work was one of preparation rather than any active part in the Reformation. He once grasped Farel, his famous pupil, by the hand saying: "Guillaume, the world is going to be renewed, and you will behold it!"<sup>1</sup> He translated the Bible into French.

The name of Luther was known in France as early as 1518, and by 1520 contemporary letters tell us that his books were selling by the hundred and that all thinking men were studying his opinions. At least seven of Luther's books were translated into French and printed during the 16th century. Two others, translated by Berquin, were found in the latter's room when his posses-

<sup>1</sup> Letter of Farel to Pellican. Herminjard. Correspondance des Reformateurs, I, 481.

sions were searched for condemnatory heretical writings. They were probably not printed.

At first the "whole band of the learned," as a contemporary puts it, were favorably inclined to the doctrines and writings of Luther. The Reformers were protected and encouraged by the king's sister, Margaret d'Angoulême, later Queen of Navarre. While she remained a Catholic to the end, she was strongly influenced by both Luther and Calvin. Among her letters we find a correspondence with Briçonnet, a letter pleading with the king to spare the life of Berquin and several letters to her cousin Sigismond von Hohenlohe who was settled in Strassburg and "propagated the doctrine of Luther by his words and writings." To the latter she said: "For your opinions and judgment are so just and holy that he who contradicts you is already condemned. You prove that you are not only a cousin in the flesh, but also of the spirit." Her poem, *The Mirror of the Sinful Soul*, was so Protestant in tone that it angered the Sorbonne. In the *Heptameron*, which gives rather a startling picture of the coarseness of the age, we find an expression of her delight in the reading of the Bible, and other Protestant tendencies. Her hatred of monks is also plainly set forth.

Among those favorable to Luther and the Reformation may be placed Clement Marot, the early Protestant poet and translator of 52 Psalms, although like others of his time he wavered and once even recanted under fear of persecution. In 1525 he wrote a letter in verse to Monsieur Bonchart asserting positively that he was neither a Lutheran nor a Zwinglian, still less an Anabaptist. His actual conversion, as described in his poem *Balladin*, occurred at Blois in 1527. In 1535, with 73 others, he was condemned to the stake. He escaped to Italy and found refuge with Renée of Ferrara. In a metrical letter written in Italy to François I, he said that there had been many false rumors against him, but that he denied them all:

"De luthériste ils m'ont donné le nom.  
Qu'à droit ce soit, je leur réponds que non.  
Luther pour moi des cieux n'est descendu,  
Luther en croix n'a pas été pendu  
Pour mes péchés; et tous bien avisé  
Au nom de lui ne suis point baptisé."

But in *Balladin*, one of his later poems, we find this expression of his religious views. In it he celebrates a virgin, Christine (Christianity), who came from the East more than 1500 years before. Simonne (Simony) was jealous of her fame. Christine fled to barbarous regions and was concealed on a rock in Saxony (the Wartburg), whence she emerged as fair as ever and called the world to her, singing verses beginning: "Come unto me, all ye who are oppressed." The fair one traveled till she reached the river Loire, where more than twenty times she cast her eyes on him (at Blois). She said to him: "Awake! It is time, my friend! You have slept too long in the gloom." By these words he knew her and a load of tormenting grief fell from his heart.

After he had publicly recanted in 1536 he translated many of the Psalms. His Protestantism was not ardent enough to make him willing to face martyrdom.

#### EARLY CATHOLICS.

As the Reformation progressed there were many instances of unfavorable opinion of Luther caused by the attitude of the Sorbonne, fear of persecution, and also because of the opposing spirit of the Renaissance and perhaps a misunderstanding of a man who was so intensely German. The Sorbonne, as the theological faculty in Paris was then called, took an important part in the discussions agitating the country and was the instigator of the worst persecutions. Its head was Noel Beda, or Bédier, a man without great learning, devoted to tradition. "In Beda alone," said Erasmus, "are three thousand monks." Under him the Sorbonne was equally op-

posed to liberal studies and the new doctrines. It was aided in its opposition by Louise of Savoy, mother of François I, who was persuaded that she could atone for her sins in this way, and by Chancellor Duprat. The Sorbonne decreed that "the impious and shameless arrogance must be restrained by chains and censure—nay, by fire and flame—rather than vanquished by argument!"

On April 15, 1521, it condemned Luther's writings to the flames, on the ground that they were seductive, insulting to the hierarchy, contrary to Scripture and schismatic. It compared *De Captivitate Babylonica*, to the Koran. It branded as preposterous the notion that God had reserved the discovery of what is needful to the salvation of the faithful for Martin Luther to make, as though Christ had left his spouse, the Church, so many centuries and until now in the darkness and blindness of error.<sup>2</sup>

By order of the Parliament of Paris a proclamation was made in August, 1521, to the sound of the trumpet, throughout the city, that all copies of the works of Luther should be given up within the space of eight days on pain of imprisonment and fine. The Reformation continued to spread in spite of the massacres and repressive measures which lasted throughout the century, culminating in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. In 1685 the Huguenots were forced into exile by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

In such a period of turmoil and vacillating opinion, it is difficult to classify some of the early Catholics, who at first were often in favor of the reform movement and afterward opposed it. In general they regarded Luther as presumptuous and arrogant in his efforts to destroy the established authority of the Church and they were also alienated by the asceticism of the adherents of the new doctrines. To them Luther was an ignorant rebellious priest attempting to overthrow the peace and unity of the Christian world. Guillaume Budé, the greatest of

2 Baird. The Rise of the Huguenots of France.

the French Humanists, who thought well of Luther at the very beginning of his career, wrote to Aleander from Dijon, June 9, 1521:

"Had that Martin, of whom you speak at the end of your last epistle, persisted in growing famous by right reason, or had he not been turned aside by the flattering reception at first accorded to his treatises, and then given himself to the pursuit of popularity, he would have never committed that crime (probably the burning of the bull is meant) on account of which he is now, to speak the truth, left without the support of the good and the wise. If, as rumor has it, even now after his condemnation he draws the crowd after him, he is a man of very feeble nature. Having, by his own force, emerged from the hidden cloister and the secluded academy, on to the public stage, the first acts of his drama were wonderful and wise, and were received by the applause of the groundlings and even with some indulgence and assent of the critics; but the catastrophe at the end was dire and repulsive, so that his almost insane confidence was forthwith overwhelmed with the hisses of the whole theater."

Brignonnet, Bishop of Meaux, at first a friend of Lefèvre and active in promoting the Reformation, soon lost his courage and was hostile to it, writing in 1523 this pronouncement against Luther:

"No one has been more presumptuous or used the axe more violently against the root of the Church than Martin Luther, who upsets the whole hierarchic order, overthrows and destroys the calling which keeps all the others in the right path (the clergy), endeavors to suppress the memory of the holy Jesus and who, despising the spiritual marriage (the priesthood) . . . admits indiscriminately the first comer, to flatter the people. . . . Now, as almost all of the world is full of his books. . . . fearing that a plant so venomous may push its roots into the pasture that is confided to us, we forbid anyone to buy, read, possess, sell, or to approve, justify or discuss in public gatherings or private conversations the works of the said Martin."

In a work on Luther written by Maimbourg, a Jesuit Church historian in 1631, considered very important at the time, is another characterization of the man as insolent and full of presumption: "He had a strong and robust constitution enabling him to endure work, without detriment to his health; a bilious and sanguine temperament; penetrating eyes full of fire; a pleasant voice, quite loud when he was animated; a proud bearing, fearless and haughty, which, however, he knew how to modify, when he liked to seem humble, modest and subdued, which did not happen very often; and there was in his soul a depth of pride and presumption, causing him to despise everything which did not agree with his own feelings, and in this spirit of brutal insolence he treated outrageously all those who were opposed to his heresy, without respecting King, Emperor or Pope, nor all that is most sacred and inviolable on the earth; incapable, besides, of retracting anything he had once asserted; angry, vindictive, imperious, always wanting to be the master and liking to be distinguished because of the novelty of his doctrine, which he wanted to establish in his school. This is the real character of Martin Luther!"

In the *Journal* of the Bourgeois de Paris we find:

"In the year 1520 there arose in the Duchy of Saxony, in Germany, a heretical doctor of theology of the order of St. Augustine, named Martin Luther, who said many things against the authority of the Pope and compiled whole books in his desire to diminish it, writing also against the ordinances and ceremonies of the Church."

Catharine de' Medici (1519-1589), who intrigued alternately with Catholics and Protestants to obtain political power, and was finally responsible for the massacre of St. Bartholomew, mentioned Luther only once, and then only to forbid a book of his being printed in France.

A legend of Luther's death that after preaching a sermon blaspheming the Virgin the devil strangled him, is found in *Les Regretz et Complaintes de passe partout et Bruit qui court.....* Par Fr. Picart, Paris 1557.



## THE RENAISSANCE.

The Renaissance began in the reign of François I who was partly Italian by education and posed as a patron of arts and letters. Moved by political considerations, he could not afford to support the Reformation, as the clergy had become thoroughly subservient by the Concordat of 1516. He was also repelled by Luther. In November, 1524, he told the papal Nuncio Aleander that he thought Luther a rascal and his doctrine pernicious. Later, moved by a poem of Clement Marot, it is said, he invited Melanchthon to France. On July 16, 1535, following the affair of the Placards, François, after having hitherto protected the Protestants, issued an edict against them. Violent persecutions of the Reformers continued during his reign. Luther distrusted François, believing him to be full of "hypocrisy, lies and fraud," and urged Melanchthon to go to France "for the sake of the pious, honorable men who barely escaped being burned."

To some of the bold, independent thinkers who were the product of the Italian Renaissance, both the intolerance of the Sorbonne and the quarrels and dogmatism of the Protestants were repellant. They remained, often, Catholic at heart, but claimed the right of complete freedom of inquiry and belief. For such an attitude Etienne Dolet, the printer—editor, a reputed son of François, was tortured, strangled and burned in 1546. His wide literary sympathies are shown in the books which were issued by his press, including the New Testament in Latin and Rabelais in French. He met More and Erasmus when he was a student in Padua. The anger of his enemies was aroused by his satirical and disputatious temperament. He ridiculed Luther in the dialogue "*De Imitatione Ciceroniana*." At another time he said:

"None of you are ignorant that the new doctrines concerning the Christian religion which Luther has been putting forward have caused great heart-burnings, and that they are only approved by certain turbulent and impiously curious persons; but you also know, when anyone

shows signs of genius and of an intellectual superiority over his fellows, he is forthwith suspected by men of a bigoted and depraved mind, of the Lutheran heresy, and is made to experience all that hatred which this accusation gives rise to. I seem to hear them charging even me with being a Lutheran. He who so lately reviled me (Pinache) has, I have no doubt, already determined to be an approver and promoter of this calumny; but in order that he may not even for a moment enjoy that pleasure or hope to see me convicted of so odious a crime, and in order that no suspicion of heresy may cleave to me or be thrown in my teeth, I most earnestly and vehemently declare and beg you all to believe, that I am not in any way a follower of that impious and obstinate sect."

Bonaventure des Périers, secretary of Margaret of Navarre, was at first Protestant in his sympathies, but, possibly under the influence of Dolet, became a sceptic and burlesqued all religions. He wrote *Cymbalum Mundi* introducing Lutherans under the anagram of Rethulus, talking with du Clénier (anagram for Incrédule) and Tryocan (Croyant). It was suppressed by order of Parliament and because of it des Périers was dismissed by Margaret.

A strong advocate of freedom of conscience, justice and peace was Jean Bodin (1530-1596), author of the first modern systematic treatise on political science. He was considered a sceptic and an atheist, but true to his principle of tolerance he was ready to accord to the doctrines of Luther the rights enjoyed by other sects and religions. He maintained that no prince should suppress religious factions by force, because the more men are opposed by violence, the more obstinate they become. After his death an unpublished Latin treatise was found, "*Colloquium Heptaplomeres*. In it religion is discussed at the house of a Catholic in Venice, by seven men—a Roman Catholic, a Lutheran, a Calvinist, a Mohammedan, a Jew, a Pagan and a believer in natural religion, with absolute impartiality. At the end of the discussion he

says, "each one, respecting the belief of the others, remains fixed in his own."

The literary movement between 1550-1580 created by the poets of the Pléiade was in violent opposition to the Reformation. Ronsard, Joachim du Bellay and their comrades belonged to the Renaissance alone. Ronsard was a lover of peace and desired political and religious unity above all things as the only means of promoting peace. He therefore hated Luther, as he considered him responsible for the civil wars that devastated France. He forgot that the violence was equal on both sides and reproached the Reformers for preaching "an armed gospel." "If the Christians continued in discord," he said, "he would rather be a pagan." His artistic nature was also repelled by the austerity of the Protestants. He describes Luther as an agitator in his *Remonstrance au peuple de France*, 1564.

"Lors Luther agité des fureurs du serpent,  
Son venin et sa rage en Saxone respand,  
Et si bien en preschant il supplie et commande,  
Quà la fin il se voit docteur d'une grand' bande."

In another poem he describes Protestant ministers as follows:

"Il ne faut pas avoir beaucoup d'experience  
Pour estre exactement docte en vostre science;  
Les barbiers, les maçons en un jour y sont clercs,  
Tant vos mysteres saincts son cachez et couvers.  
Il faut tant seulement avecques hardiesse  
Detester le Papat, parler contre la messe,  
Estre sobre en propos, barbe longue, et le front  
De rides laboré, l'oeil farouche et profond.  
Les cheveux mal peignez, le sourcy qui s'avale,  
Le maintien refrongué, le visage tout pasle,  
Se monstrier rarement, composer maint escrit,  
Parler de l'Eternal, de Seigneur et de Christ,  
Avoir d'un grand manteau les espaules couverts,  
Bref, estre bon brigand et ne jurer que: 'Certes.' "

In his *Elégie sur le Tumulte d'Amboise* he laments the religious innovations and divisions in France:

"Heureuse les pères vieux des bons siècles passés  
Qui sont, sans varier, en leur foi trépassés  
Ains que de tant d'abus l'Eglise fut malade!  
Qui n'ouïrent jamais parler d'Oecolampade,  
De Zwingle, de Bucer, de Luther, de Calvin,  
Mais, sans rien innover au service divin,  
Ont vécu longuement, puis, d'un fin heureuse,  
Ont Jésus rendu leur âme généreuse!  
Las! pauvre France, hélas! comme une opinion  
Diverse a corrompu ta première union!"

The sympathies of Rabelais were wholly with the Renaissance. He does not mention Luther, but his opinion may be deduced from his letter to Erasmus, saying, "Did I not put down as owing to you alone all I am and all that I am worth, I should be the most thankless of men now living," and from his satire in the fourth book of *Pantagruel* on both Catholics and Protestants, calling the latter "demoniacal Calvins, imposters of Geneva." According to Calvin, "Rabelais, des Périers and many others whom I shall not name for the present, after having relished the gospel, are stricken with blindness. The dogs of whom I speak, in order to speak their blasphemies more freely, make jokes, go about to banquets and lively gatherings, and there, talking loosely, destroy, as far as they are able, all reverence for God." An Oxford professor, Ingram Byewater, recently discovered and bought a copy of Melanchthon's *De Anima* with Rabelais' signature, showing that he occasionally read the German Reformers. Rabelais did not hesitate also to attack the evils of the Catholic Church and the cupidity of the monks.

Montaigne was a contemporary of Ronsard. His middle life was spent in the beginning of a period of disenchantment. The Reformation had produced wars and discord and the Protestants were as intolerant as the Catholics. The first rapture of the Renaissance was

over. The vices of the time were cruelty and treachery. Montaigne believed that religion had failed to make men moral. If he looked askance at the Reformation, which to many seemed a liberal movement, it was because his radicalism was so much more profound than Luther's. He speaks favorably of Erasmus but says of the Reformers. "Those who in my time have attempted to correct the fashions of this world by new opinions reform the vices of appearances; those of essence they leave untouched if they increase them not."

In his essay, *Apology for Raimond Sebonde*, he makes the statement, often set forth by later Catholics, that Protestantism tends to scepticism by upsetting "ancient beliefs." He says:

"Peter Brunel, a man of great reputation for knowledge in his time, having, with some others of his sort, stayed some days at Montaigne in my father's company, he presented him at his departure with a book, entitled *Theologia naturalis; sive, Liber creaturarum, magistri Raimondi de Sebonde*. And as the Italian and Spanish tongues were familiar to my father, and as this book was written in a sort of a jargon of Spanish with Latin termination, he hoped that, with a little help, he might be able to understand it, and therefore recommend it to him for a very useful book, and proper for the time wherein he gave it to him; which was when the novel doctrines of Martin Luther began to be in vogue, and in many places to stagger our ancient belief; wherein he was very well advised, wisely, in his own mind, foreseeing that the beginning of this distemper would easily run into an execrable atheism, for the vulgar, not having the faculty of judging things, suffering themselves to be carried away by chance and appearances, after having been once inspired with the boldness to despise and control those opinions which they had before in extreme reverence, such as those wherein their salvation is concerned, and that some of the articles of their religion are brought into doubt and dispute, they afterwards throw all other parts of their belief into the same uncertainty, they having in

them no authority or foundation than the others they had already discomposed."

#### THE HUGUENOTS.

The Reformation, at first hardly more than a vague yearning, a protest against ecclesiastical abuses, took definite virile form under Calvin. The early Reformers were entirely dependent on Luther, but later they abandoned all connection with Lutheranism and began to organize as a church and as a political body, according to the ideas of Calvin given in his famous *Institutio Christianae Religionis*. They were first called Huguenots about 1560. No satisfactory explanation of this political nick-name has ever been given. In 1558 they were said to have had two thousand places of worship.

Calvin fled from France in 1533, on account of the persecutions following the posting of the Placards, and settled in Geneva in 1536. Under his guidance the Swiss city soon became to the French Protestants what Wittenberg was to the Germans. Calvin was Luther's truest pupil and took everything from him. He referred to him very often and generally praised him, but regretted "the vehemence of Luther's temperament, which was so apt to boil over in every direction" and to "flash his lightning sometimes also on the servants of the Lord." He said: "I consider Luther a notable apostle of Christ by whose work and ministry the purity of the gospel has been chiefly restored at this time." In April, 1552, he said that Luther thought well of his (Calvin's) writings. In a letter written to Bullinger, Nov. 25th, 1544, he writes of Luther: "Consider what a great man Luther is, what a gift he has, with what power, steadfastness, ability and learning he has fought against the kingdom of the Antichrist and for the spread of the true doctrine of salvation. I have often said of him that, even should he call me a devil, I would yet show him due honor and consider him as a special servant of God, although he suffers from grave faults."



The controversy in the Protestant Churches over the doctrine of the Corporeal Presence was intensely bitter and in the heat of argument Luther was not always so complimentary to Calvin. However, when he read the tract, "*De Coena*," in a bookseller's shop in Wittenberg, he said to his friend Maurice Geltschen, who was with him: "Maurice, this is certainly a learned and pious man and I might well have entrusted this controversy to him from the beginning. If my opponents had done the like, we should soon have been reconciled." Calvin wrote to Luther early in 1545, but Luther never answered him.

Calvin has often been quoted as referring to Luther as the "thunder-bolt of God, God's lightning." There seems to be no authority for this beyond this paragraph in his *Response Contra Pighium*: "You say that Luther speaks this hyperbolically? If I concede this, I assert that he had a just cause for such hyperboles, inasmuch as he saw the world so stupefied by this false and pernicious faith in works, as by a mortal lethargy, so that he saw there was, in order to purge it, need not of words but of the clangor of the trumpet, of thunder and of lightning." The impression probably originated with Bossuet's statement in his *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestant*: "Calvin often admired his virtues, his magnanimity, his constancy, his incomparable skill in opposing the Pope. He is the trumpet, or rather the thunder, he is the thunder-bolt which has dragged the world from its lethargy; it was not Luther who spoke; it was God who thundered from his mouth."

Beza (Théodore de Bèze) 1519-1605, successor to Calvin as leader of the Church at Geneva, completed Marot's translation of the Psalms, upheld the Huguenot cause by his eloquence at the Colloquy of Poissy and persuaded Jeanne d'Albret, daughter of Margaret of Navarre, to become a devoted Protestant. He wrote in verse of Luther to this effect: "Rome by her might subdued the world, the Pope subjugated Rome by fraud. How much greater than either is Luther who has conquered them

both with his pen only. Go to, now, lying Greece, boast of Hercules; his iron club is nothing compared to Luther's pen."

On a brief visit to Italy Calvin stayed with Renée, daughter of Louis XII of France, and by marriage Duchess of Ferrara, with whom he afterwards corresponded for some years. While she protected Marot and Calvin and other Reformers, her attitude toward the Reformation was much like that of Margaret of Navarre. She remained a Catholic as long as she lived in Italy, but when she returned to France in her widowhood she was more inclined to the Protestant Church.

The hatred and persecutions of the Sorbonne excited the curiosity of Louis de Berquin in the books of Lefèvre and the German Reformers. In his admiration and desire to defend Luther he translated two treatises, *De Votis Monasticis* and *Warumb des Bapsts un seyner Jungern bucher von Doc. Martino Luther vorbrant seyn*. They were probably not published. He decried the ignorance of the Paris theologians, and when Luther's books were found in his room, he refused to retract his Protestant beliefs. He was also the translator of Erasmus. He was imprisoned three times and finally burned for heresy.

Coligny (1517-1572), another great noble to devote his life to the Protestant cause and finally to die for it, was more of a Calvinist than a Lutheran. He protected the Huguenots and sent a colony to Brazil. As a leader of the Protestants he demanded religious toleration. In his last will and testament he gives his confession of faith, declaring his belief that the Bible is the real Word of God and that his salvation is in Jesus Christ alone. He closes by affirming his adherence to the Reformed Church, saying that he would consider himself happy to be permitted to suffer for its sake. Sully, the Protestant statesman and minister of Henry IV, kept pictures of Luther and Calvin in his room.

As Luther's hymn, *Ein Feste Burg*, runs as a motive through the opera of *The Huguenots*, appearing and dis-

appearing until it is finally chanted in unison at the close of the opera, so Luther's words and influence are interwoven with the history of the early Huguenot Church, not always to be found in expressed opinion, but a moving force whether it is stated by individual Protestants or not.

#### THE CLASSICS (17TH CENTURY).

<sup>3</sup>Individualism, liberty of thought, political and religious independence and resultant divisions, were the characteristics of the 16th Century. In the 17th Century there was a reaction against liberty which had finally become chaos, and a return to the authority of an Infallible Church and a desire for national unity. The latter was achieved by the policies of Richelieu and Louis XIV, but resulted in the irreparable loss of the Huguenot emigrants, and the strong spirit of independence disappeared under the sway of monarchical despotism.

It was the great classical period and Racine, Molière, Corneille, La Fontaine, etc., were little concerned with Luther. But the most able and eloquent attack on Luther and Protestantism ever made was that by Jacques-Bénigne de Bossuet (1627-1704) in his *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestants*. It is an ingenious and forcible argument in favor of the unity and authority of the Catholic Church as against the conflicting and inconsistent views of the Protestant sects, which, he thought, tended to scepticism and to subversion of the State. He maintained that Protestantism was condemned by its contradictions, that having thrown over its authorized interpreter of religion, it varied more and more on increasingly important points. He attributed the beginning of the Reformation to the jealous quarrels between the Augustinians and the Dominicans over the sale of indulgences. In spite of his eloquence he was not always fair in his discussions, being often intensely partisan, and it is a blot on his memory that he upheld the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Of Luther he wrote: "It is true

3 Wright; History of French Literature.

there was some force in his genius, some vehemence in his discourse, a lively and impetuous eloquence that carried along and ravished the people, an extraordinary boldness when he saw himself sustained and applauded, an air of authority that made his disciples tremble before him so that they dared contradict him neither in great things nor in small."

The conversion of the Protestants, as a means of obtaining religious and political unity, was one of the ruling passions of Fénelon's (1651-1715) life, as it was with Bossuet. They disagreed on other points and in spite of their desire for unity carried on an acrimonious controversy over quietistic mysticism, in which Fénelon sided with Madame Guyon. In a sermon for St. Bernard's Day Fénelon, a man of Southern birth, said characteristically of the Protestants: "In the North, proud and fantastic sects, the fruit of another age, trifle with the Scriptures, and justify thereby every strange vision of their hearts."

The Jansenist movement was a religious revival within the Church of Rome. Port-Royal stood for a living faith and was an ascetic protest against the scepticism and loose morals of the 16th century. It repudiated the doctrine of justification by faith, but insisted on conscious conversion. The Jansenists held the name of Luther in pious Catholic horror, but were nearer to him than they suspected. Their doctrine of predestination was the same as Calvin's although they looked on him as a heretic. Their strongest weapons in contending against the Jesuits were the satirical attacks in the *Lettres Provinciales* of Pascal.

#### THE PHILOSOPHERS. (18TH CENTURY).

The philosophers of the 18th century, partisans of advanced thought, who proclaimed the right of reason to rebel against authority, ridiculed religion, Luther as well as the Church. The movement began in an intellectual revolt against the restraint imposed by Louis XIV on all

irregularity of thought or doctrine. Under him both Jansenists and Huguenots suffered persecution. A large group of literary men of the period were agreed in their opposition to the Church and their contempt for the "superstitions of the past" and horror of the government of Louis XIV. It was a period of expansion and cosmopolitanism. M. Faguet says that the 17th century had been religious and French. The 18th century was neither religious nor French. The wide influence of France was partly due to the enforced exile of thousands of intelligent Huguenots after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

Pierre Bayle (1647-1706) belonged chronologically to the latter half of the 17th century but he was a predecessor of Voltaire, a philosopher of the transition period. Although some of his followers were extremely intolerant men, he had a passion for tolerance and maintained that it was impossible to be really convinced of anything. He was therefore hostile to the Catholic claim of the infallibility of the Church and the similar claim of the Protestants in regard to the Bible. His demand for religious freedom followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the persecutions causing the death of his own brother. In his great *Dictionnaire historique et critique* published in Rotterdam in 1697, in an article on *Luther*, he defends him against the absurd lies brought against him, as that he was an atheist and had *Amadis of Gaul* translated into good French to put people out of conceit with the Bible.

Voltaire (1694-1778) has been denounced because of his reasoned and destructive attacks upon religion and doctrinal superstition, which were made without the faintest trace of religious spirit, but as the advocate of liberty, tolerance and justice, he stood for the Renaissance of the 18th century.<sup>4</sup> No previous writer can compare with him in wideness and justness of views of the past. "History," said he, "is not to be treated as anec-

4 W. E. H. Lecky; *History of England*, vol. 5, 1887, chapter 20.

dotes of courts and camps, but should be made a record and explanation of the true development of nations, of causes of growth and decay and characteristic virtues and vices, changes in laws, customs, opinions, social conditions." He once said that his aim was not to make a revolution like that of Luther and Calvin, but to enlighten the minds of the rulers of men.

In his *Dictionnaire Philosophique* the following paragraph is interesting as one of the first attempts at an "economic interpretation" of the Reformation. He speaks of the effect of climate on religion: "There are some nations whose religion is the result of neither climate nor government. What cause detached North Germany, Denmark, most of Switzerland, Holland, England, Scotland and Ireland from the Roman communion? Poverty. Indulgences and deliverances from purgatory for the souls of those whose bodies had no money, were sold too dear. The prelates and monks absorbed the whole revenue of a province. People adopted a cheaper religion. In fine, after numerous civil wars, it was concluded that the papal faith was good for nobles and the reformed faith for citizens."

In his *Essai sur les Moeurs et l'Esprit des Nations*, important as the first philosophical history of modern times, Voltaire, like Bossuet, attributes the Reformation to the quarrels of two rival orders of monks, as to which of them should have the German agency for the sale of indulgences, and "this little monkish squabble in a corner of Saxony caused more than 100 years of discords, rages and misfortunes in 30 nations. This great revolution in the human spirit and in the political system of Europe was begun by Martin Luther." It was hardly possible that a man who was opposed to all theology should understand Luther or Calvin. Of them he says: "Calvin wrote better than Luther and spoke worse: both were industrious and austere, but hard and violent; both burned with ardor to distinguish themselves and dominate those who flattered their vanity." He thought Luther very



coarse in his treatment of his adversaries, but says that in marrying he did not break his vows any more than those who professed humility and poverty but were in reality rich.

In Diderot's *Encyclopédie*, published in 1778, is an unsigned article on *Lutheranism* (there is none on Luther), which is remarkable as being an ultra-Catholic view-point in a work published by an atheist. The author says that Luther preached against indulgences because they were given to Dominicans and he was an Augustinian, that in 1525 he seduced a nun, Catherine "de Bere," debauched her and then married her, that he was protected by "duc Saxe Georges." He gives a short resumé of his doctrine and says that 39 sects have sprung from him. He adds that the "Reformation" is "un titre abusif," for the power of reform belongs to the Church alone.

The greatest writer of the period on political science was Montesquieu (1689-1755), a liberal and tolerant theorist. In his *Esprit des Loix* he advances the theory of the influence of climate and environment on national characteristics. This theory is applied to the Reformation in Book 25, where he writes with the sympathy and tolerance lacking in the sophisticated philosophers of the time. He defends religion as useful to a State and says that religion follows the laws of the State in which it originates. He says that the north of Europe became Protestant because of the free spirit of the people, which was wanting in the South. He continues: "Even in countries where the Protestant religion established itself, its revolution followed the plan of the civil polity. Luther, having for him great princes, could hardly have made them relish an ecclesiastical authority without external rank, and Calvin, having for him people living in republics or the obscure bourgeois in monarchies was very well able to get along without rank and dignities. Each of these religions might think itself the most perfect, the Calvinist judging himself more conformable to what Jesus Christ said; the Lutheran to what the apostles did."

While Voltaire was concerned with intellectual movements and was actively hostile to the superstitious and ridiculous aspects of religion in his time, Rousseau (1712-1778) thought more of social justice and the simplification of religion, with a certain attempt at system. A believer in a God who "touches the heart," he might have been inclined to Protestantism if he had not been persecuted and alienated by the Reformers at Geneva. He asserted that freedom of individual reason was the veritable spirit and real foundation of the Reformation and thought the Lutherans inconsistent above all others in their assumption of authority. While he was more favorable to the Church of Geneva he called Calvin a "tyrannical reformer." In his *Lettres écrites de la Montagne*, written to refute *Letters écrites de la Compagne* of the Genevan Tronchin he attacks the Reformers for their inconsistent assumption of authority, in this way: "When the Reformers began to make themselves heard, the Church Universal was at peace; all opinions were unanimous; not one essential dogma was disputed among Christians. In this state of tranquility all at once two or three men raised their voices, and cried to all Europe: 'Christians, beware, you are mistaken, you are being led astray, you are being carried on the road to hell; the Pope is antichrist, the tool of Satan; his church is the school of lies. You are lost if you listen.' . . . 'But', someone answers them, 'who has appointed you to trouble the peace of the Church and public tranquility?' 'Our consciences,' they cry, 'reason, the inward light! the law of God which it would be criminal to resist.' . . . But the Catholics would have greatly embarrassed them if they had said to them: 'See how unjust you are. . . . You claim the right to interpret Scripture according to your whims, and you dare to deprive us of the same liberty. You dogmatize, you preach, you censure, you anathematize, you excommunicate, you punish, you put to death, you exercise the authority of the prophets. What! you innovators, on your own opinion upheld by a few men, burn your adversaries! And we, with 15 centuries behind us, and the

voice of 100 millions of men, we are wrong to burn you?" In answer to this they would have been obliged to keep silence or perform miracles: sad resources for the lovers of truth." From Rousseau proceeded Romanticism with the cult of nature and a sentimental half-Christianity, the Christianity of Châteaubriand and Renan.

The destructive critical temper of the 18th century led to the revolutionary spirit, which was the right of private judgment as developed by the Reformation, carried to its extreme limit. During the Reign of Terror atheism was exalted and Christianity denounced as superstition. After the death of Robespierre a reaction set in and the churches were reopened. Under Napoleon toleration for non-Catholics was restored, although he too, soon became tyrannical and intolerant. He has been often quoted as saying that "if Charles V had adopted the cause of Luther at Worms he could have conquered Europe."<sup>5</sup> When Napoleon was determined to crush all evidence of the German spirit in France, Madame de Staël argued in favor of the Northern race. She said that one of the chief reasons for the superiority of Northern writers was the Protestant religion of the North as opposed to the Catholicism of the South. There were only three translations of Luther's books during the century.

#### THE ROMANTIC MOVEMENT.

The followers of Romanticism, a reaction from Classicism and from Voltaire exalting the imagination and feelings above reason, had a very high appreciation of Luther, due partly to their love for the Middle Ages and all that the "philosophers" despised. They were influenced in part by Madame de Staël's *De l'Allemagne* and by Romantic German writers.

Châteaubriand (1768-1848), the founder of 19th century Romanticism, was converted from infidelity to an

<sup>5</sup> The Continental Reformation. Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D., p. 120.

emotional and esthetic Catholicism. To him Christianity was "all beauty" and a personal unsuppressed experience of life the chief means of arriving at truth. His influence was tremendous and it was considered possible once more to give expression to religious feelings without seeming ridiculous. He was naturally less favorable to Luther and the Reformation than the Protestant Romanicists. In his *Génie du Christianisme* (1802) he makes a poetical defense of Christianity. He says that it began in the time of Julian to be loaded with disgrace and contempt, but from the time of Julian to Luther the Church flourished and had no need of apologists. That the Protestants at first had superiority, at least in regard to forms. "Erasmus himself was weak when opposed to Luther." He adds that it was natural that schism should lead to infidelity. "Bayle and Leibnitz arose after Calvin." In describing his travels in Germany he writes: "Luther's tomb at Wittenberg did not tempt me: Protestantism in religion is only an illogical heresy, in politics only an abortive revolution," and again, "The Reformation as I have already said, makes a mistake when it shows itself in the Catholic monuments upon which it has encroached; it cuts a mean and shameful figure there. Those tall porches call for a numerous clergy, the pomp of the celebrations, the chants, pictures, flowers and incense of the altars! Protestantism may say as much as it pleases that it has returned to primitive Christianity; the Gothic Churches reply that it has denied its fathers; the Christians who were the architects of its wonders were other than the children of Luther and Calvin."

In the famous group of Romantic historians which belonged to the first half of the 19th century, Guizot (1787-1874) was a rigid Protestant and an admirer of Luther. He said that the freeing of the human spirit "as a fact rather than a principle" went back to the Reformation. To the devoted friends, Michelet and Quinet, Germany was a source of inspiration. Quinet was the greatest expo-

nent of German ideas in France. He was a Huguenot without a creed and anti-Catholic. His sympathies were with democracy and free-thought. There is a celebrated page in his *La Révolution* on the origin of liberty in the United States: "A few forlorn men arrive on the coasts of North America; poor, nameless, and without a past they carry but one book with them: it is the Bible. They open it on the shore and immediately begin to raise the new city on the plan of the book restored by Luther. All American institutions bear the seal of the Reformation, for each of the founders goes apart into the depths of the forests; there he is king of a little world; he is the monarch of a physical and moral universe. Nature and the Bible guide him. In this immensity, he is himself a church, priest, king and artisan all together, he baptises his children; he marries them. Gradually other similar sovereigns reach his borders almost imperceptibly; the interspaces are filled; the cabin develops into a village and the villages into a town. Society is evolved without the individual yielding any of his power. The Gospel which is everywhere open to all is the primitive bond of these hermits and makes them the citizens of a republic of peers."

Michelet, of Protestant ancestry, was a worshipper of Luther. Of the man he says: "And among these joys Luther had those of the heart, of the man, the innocent happiness of the family and home. What family more holy, what home more pure? . . . Holy hospitable table, where I myself, for a long time a guest, have found so many divine fruits on which my heart yet lives. . . . Yes, the happy years I spent reading Luther have left me a strength, a vigor (*sève*), which I hope God will preserve to me until death." And of his influence: "Luther has been the restorer of liberty, and, if we exercise in all its plenitude this highest privilege of human intelligence, it is to him we are indebted for it. To whom do I owe the power of publishing what I am now writing, except to this liberator of modern thought?"

Victor Hugo (1802-1885) leader of the Romantic school

in the 19th century, writes in his *Choix entre les deux Nations*, addressing Germany:

"Et les peuples t'ont vue, o guerrière feconde,  
Rebelle au double joug qui pèse sur le monde,  
Dresser, pourtant l'aurore entre tes poings de fer,  
Contre César Hermann, contre Pierre Luther."

In his "Last Thoughts" he makes the oft-repeated accusation: "Luther, after having sapped the great Catholic unity at its base, vainly essayed in turn to leave after him a religious unity."

Prosper Mérimée, who was perhaps more of a realist than a romanticist, writes enthusiastically to his Unknown Lady: "The other night when I could hardly breathe I read Luther's Table Talk. I like the big man with all his prejudices and his hatred for the devil."

Verhaeren, the modern Romanticist, in *Les Rythmes Souverains*, represents great men and great events as the symbols of primary ideas.

In the poem on Martin Luther he says:

"Bien que le monde entier pesât sur son cerveau  
Avec ses vieux décrets et ses vieux anathèmes,  
Rien n'empêcha Martin Luther  
Devant l'aube du matin clair  
De penser par lui-même.  
Il libéra le monde, en étant soi, pour tous.  
Comme une forteresse, il maintenait debout,  
Près de son coeur, sa conscience."

Philaret Chasle in an article: "*La Renaissance Sensuelle*, Luther, Rabelais, Skeleton, Folengo." (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, March 1842) saw in Luther the apostle of the movement against asceticism which he thought accompanied the Renaissance. G. Brunet in his *Propos de Table de M. Luther*, 1844, makes the most of Luther's indecencies.



## MODERN PROTESTANT OPINION.

The religious awakening among French Protestants in the early part of the 19th century in Switzerland produced two notable men, both strong admirers of Luther. Alexandre Rodolphe Vinet (1797-1847) French-Swiss theologian and critic, friend of Saint-Beuve, one of them, wrote of Luther: "In spirits thus gifted—its burning and shining lights—the Church must be willing to rejoice for a season, for much that they bring with them will depart when they go; the foreign element will break up and scatter when the cord that binds them together is slackened by absence or unloosed by death..... Much of their work seems to vanish with them, reappearing after a time in humbler forms."

Merle d'Aubigné (1794-1872), the other, historian of the Reformation, and president of the theological school of Geneva, said of Luther: "He was the first to proclaim the great principles of humanity and religious liberty; he was far beyond his own age and even beyond many of the Reformers in toleration." In his history, which is excellent, using sources extensively and even archives for the French Reformation, he says again of Luther: "At Worms he pronounced the sublime words that at the distance of three centuries still make our hearts bound within us. It was a critical moment for Christendom. On the yea or nay of a monk depended the repose of the Church and the world for ages to come." He states that the Reformation was necessary and that otherwise ruin would have ensued; society would have been a prey to destructive elements and without regenerative principles.

In many quarters in France as well as in this country Luther is held responsible for this present war. John Vienot, the Protestant pastor, in various addresses has combatted these attacks. He has said that the principle of the Reformation was individualism and that the principle of Germany to-day is organization, that Germany to-day is fighting against her own soul and against Luther's ideals of liberty and democracy. Paul Sabatier in

his *Modernism* (1908) thinks that the difference between Protestantism and Catholicism is that the Protestant is an individualist, that Catholics are dominated by the idea of community. He says that Modernism is not an infiltration of Protestantism, that Protestant science is pausing while Catholic science is producing one masterpiece after another. "In exegesis the Protestant approaches text like a judge, e. g., Luther judged Epistle of James 'an epistle of straw.' But the Modernist says: 'It must speak, not we.'" There were six translations of Luther's books during the 19th century.

#### MODERN CATHOLIC OPINION.

By the modern Catholics Luther is damned by faint praise, to which a variety of derogatory accusations are added. Audin in his *Vie de Luther*, 1839, written very inaccurately and with a bad tone, says: "Without denying the gifts which he received from heaven, we shall examine what use he made of them." He then recounts "his continual variations, the impossibilities which he advances for proofs, his prophecies of the fall of the Roman Church, his blasphemies against the chair of St. Peter, his outrages on tradition, his contempt for the splendors of the priesthood and human nature, his gall and abuse for those who did not believe in the creed of Wittenberg."

The subsequent work of Christiani and Paquier copies partly Bossuet but even more, modern writers in Germany, especially Denifle whose *Luther und Luthertum* has been translated into French. Paquier in *Le Protestantisme Allemand* says that no one but a German can understand Luther. He holds Protestantism responsible for the German tendency to worship force in the place of right. "Nothing in the present war would have been alien to Luther, for, like all Germans of to-day he was disloyal and violent. The theory of Nietzsche is monstrous, but it is the logical conclusion of the religious revolution accomplished by Luther and the philosophical revolution accomplished by Kant."

## CRITICS AND PHILOSOPHERS.

The 19th century produced great critics, as well as historians. Jules Lemaitre (b. 1853) an "impressionist" like Anatole France, brilliant and frivolous, ridicules the Reformation and quotes approvingly Cherbuliez's reference to "this débonnaire movement" and his statement that "a good Pope would have sufficed to correct the abuses which no doubt existed." Leo Claretie, in his *History of French Literature* (1905) with the color and vividness, characteristic of many modern French writers, describes Luther sympathetically—how "From the Wartburg, he flung his pamphlets, printed as well as written, and they reached the most distant provinces; they were read during the evenings, with passion; the people were roused, fascinated by the lyric or violent appeals, sometimes full of a sublime vigor, sometimes with a humorous satire against the Pope and the bishops, sometimes with a dreamy and passionate emotion, always with an ardent conviction. It brought on the movement, roused Europe, and swept on unhindered."

Brunetière (1849-1906), in spite of his affection for the Catholic Church and glorification of the 17th century, concedes that Bossuet did not do full justice to the Reformation. "People think that he did not sufficiently praise Luther and Calvin; they complain that he dragged into the light more vexatious sides of their characters, leaving the more beautiful in the shade. And, indeed, while he may have acknowledged himself from the beginning of his history, the necessity of a Reformation of the Church in its head and in its members, it seems as if afterwards he had forgotten it too much. If the Reformation had no doubt nothing of the supernatural, nothing of the divine in its principle, it always had something profoundly moral, and in this sense truly Christian. One could wish that Bossuet had stated it more strongly."

Emile Faguet in his *Seizième Siècle* also commends the Reformation, stating that it was "the greatest spiritual awakening since the coming of Christianity." He thinks

that the Reformation was penetrated by the spirit of the Renaissance—the tendency towards personal investigation and inquiry, and that if the movements were not directed to the same goal that at least they moved in the same direction. He says: "Thirty years after Luther there were in the Protestant world more different and opposing doctrines than there had been heresies in the four first centuries of Christianity. All had a Luther no longer recognizable as Luther and no one had the right to say, 'This is the real one.' All claimed to be the sole exponents of the Gospel. Protestantism was already liberty of thought."

Another Frenchman who has recently traced the ideas and impulses leading to the present war back to Luther, is Baron Denys Cochin, one of the Catholic party of France in Parliament. I quote his statement as given to the Associated Press and translated in the New York Times: "Literary Germany and philosophic Germany, the Kants and the Fichtes, prepared the evolution of the State, the cult of might, with their celebrated "Die Welt Geschichte ist das Welt Gericht," (The World's History is the World's Tribunal) at once explained and completed by the words, "Deutschland uber Alles." The haughty and aristocratic reform of Luther both prepared and seconded the aberration. "I am and shall always remain," said Hegel, "a pure Lutheran."

Of the philosophers, Renan, (1823-1892) in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Nov. 1, 1869, says, "Germany in the 16th century accomplished a work of the greatest importance, the Reformation," and of Luther, "Calvin lacked that deep, vivid, sympathetic ardor which was one of the secrets of Luther's success."

A page from Amiel's *Journal Intime* (1882) is interesting in the present crisis as the opinion of a descendant of Huguenots driven from France by the edict of Nantes, but strongly affected by his sympathy with German ideas during his four years of study in Berlin. "How is the conflict to be solved, since there is no longer one single common principle between the partisans and the enemies

of the existing form of society, between liberalism and the worship of equality? Their respective notions of man, duty, happiness—that is to say, of life and its end—differ radically. I suspect that the communism of the *Internationale* is merely the pioneer of Russian nihilism, which will be the common grave of the old races and the servile races, the Latins and the Slavs. If so, the salvation of humanity will depend upon individualism of the brutal American sort. I believe that the nations of the present are rather tempting chastisement than learning wisdom. Wisdom, which means balance and harmony, is only met with in individuals. Democracy, which means the rule of the masses, gives preponderance to instinct, to nature, to the passions—that is to say, to blind impulse, to elemental gravitation, to generic fatality. Luther's comparison of humanity to a drunken peasant, always ready to fall from his horse on one side or the other, has always struck me as a particularly happy one. It is not that I deny the right of democracy, but I have no sort of illusion as to the use it will make of its right so long, at any rate, as wisdom is the exception and conceit the rule."

In *Science et Religion dans la Philosophie Contemporaine*, Boutroux, one of the leading philosophers of today, gives his philosophical view of the Reformation: "From the internal dissolution of Scholasticism, as also from external circumstances, there resulted the double movement which characterized the Renaissance period. On the one side, mystical Christianity, which put the essence of religion in inward life, in the direct relation of the soul to God, in the personal experiences of salvation and sanctification, broke away violently from the traditional Church. And one circumstance helped to give what was called the Reformation precision and settled purpose, without which it would have remained, perhaps, a mere spiritual aspiration, analogous to those which manifested themselves in the Middle Ages. The need of personal religious life which was the foundation of it, came into line with that love of old texts, re-established

in their genuineness and purity, which Humanism had just initiated. Just as the Catholics of the Middle Ages had associated Aristotle and the theology of the Fathers, so Luther combined Erasmus and the mystic sense. And, thus renewed, the Christian idea yielded fresh scope."

#### RECENT HISTORICAL ESTIMATES.

Recent historical estimates of Luther have been fair and less partisan in this respect than either German or English work. Some inherited prejudices are found. Reinach in his *Orpheus*, (1909) reflects Voltaire unduly, quoting from him largely and exclusively in regard to the Reformation. J. Fabre, in *La Pensée Moderne, De Luther a Leibnitz*, 1908, is too uncritical in praise of Luther as the precursor of rational religion. The *Historie Générale* of Lavissee and Rambeaud is perfectly objective. It finds in Lefèvre d'Étaples an expression of the spirit of the Reformation in France up to the time of Calvin. *Les Origines de la Théologie Moderne*, (1901) by A. Humbert, a Catholic modernist, is put on the index, but is of the best quality. Humbert finds in the Reformation an "alliance of biblicism and nationalism destructive of all social order in the Church and the State," but does not let his final conclusion interfere with his fairness in presenting facts. A. Loisy says, "We are done with partial heresies," meaning Protestantism. He criticises Harnack very acutely for considering himself a disciple of Luther while rejecting his dogmas. "What would Luther have thought if his doctrine of salvation by faith had been presented to him with the amendment 'faith in the merciful Father, for faith in the Son is foreign to the Gospel of Jesus.'" (*L'Évangile et L'Eglise*).

As a final estimate of Luther, I shall give that of Imbart de la Tour, because of its excellence, published first in *Le Revue des deux Mondes*, 1912, and then in *Les Origines de la Réforme*. He was influenced by Lamprecht and still more, perhaps, at least verbally, by Heine, whose *History of German Religion and Philosophy* was

published about 1840 in both French and German. Imbart de la Tour says that the logical result of some of Luther's doctrines would have been individual religion and autonomy of conscience, but in fact "his completely mystical doctrine of inner inspiration has no resemblance whatever to our subjectivism. The idea of a doctrinal truth and a religious society always obsessed him." He thinks it remarkable that Luther's pessimistic doctrine could succeed in young, ardent society, but that he owed his success in the first place to himself. He characterizes him thus: "Mysticism carried to the point of hallucination and a practical sense sharpened for combat, armed both with calculation and courage, brusquerie and duplicity; those exquisite flowers of the soul, poetry and tenderness, and a subsoil of instinct; hymns soaring to heaven and obscenities trailing in the mire; pure emotions and a coarse, ready laugh; depressions of humility and spasms of pride; the simplest affirmations creating certainty, and the subtlest sophistry torturing the truth; every thing in him disconcerts, but everything draws us, carries us along, arouses us."

*New York City.*



## ARTICLE II.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.<sup>1</sup>

BY HON. LOUIS W. FAIRFIELD.

For many years it has been customary to celebrate Washington's birthday. The present time lends added interest to that occasion. We are met when a mighty struggle is being waged to determine whether the principles for which he fought shall be permitted to live in any human government, or whether the principles against which he fought shall at last prevail.

More than 140 years have come and gone since the Continental Congress called him to the command of that motley army besieging Boston. Since then many a difficult problem has arisen. In all these problems, his course while living has been fully justified by succeeding events.

It has been said that "George Washington was the Revolution." So fulsome are the eulogies pronounced upon his life that, at times, one is in doubt as to their merit. Men have set before them the task of drawing this super-man from the skies. His public career is an open book. Every phase of his service to his State and the Nation may be studied in his letters, his public documents and the writings of his contemporaries. The account of his childhood is meager. It abounds in moral stories that would make him appear to be abnormal, not that he was immoral. Judged by his subsequent career he must have been a boy with red blood in his veins.

Washington eludes us as no other man in history. Yet we know there were in him the elements of our common humanity. No one can lead who has not a large measure of human sympathy. Leadership must be wise first. It

<sup>1</sup> An address delivered at Gettysburg, Pa., February 22nd, 1917, by the Hon. Louis W. Fairfield, a member of Congress from the Twelfth District, Indiana.

must have in mind ever the average man, his hopes, his fears, his strength, his weakness, his foibles, his failures—the common man of whom Lincoln said God had made so many.

No stupid man, no heartless man, no ignorant man, can long be the idol of any people. We reach our estimate of the common human qualities in the character of Washington through an inductive study of the individual instances in which his acts betray that he was neither free from the weaknesses nor the temptations of the common man; but at best the account is meager. For the most part we are driven to our conclusions from the strange power he ever retained over the men with whom he was closely associated through nearly fifty years.

In 1754 the event at Fort Necessity made him known throughout the colonies, and to France and England; in France denounced as the murderer of Jumonville; in England, praised as the defender of the crown. From that day to the day of his death, a period of forty-five years, he was the foremost man in Virginia. And from the day he took charge of that crowd of patriots, from the store, the shop and the plow, besieging General Gage in Boston, to the day when at loved Mount Vernon he breathed his life away, he was the foremost man in America. For a hundred years since his death he has ranked among the foremost men of the world.

There is a strange spell about his life that cannot be exorcised.

The eminent scholar and distinguished statesman, Henry Cabot Lodge, in a two-volume work expressly written to reveal whatever weakness he may have had, and to rescue him from the myth of being "a blameless prigish boy" and an equally "faultless and uninteresting man," concludes in the following words: "As I bring these volumes to a close, I am conscious that where they speak at all it is in a tone of almost unbroken praise of the great man whom they attempt to portray. If this be so, it is because I could come to no other conclusion."

We know next to nothing of his childhood. At fourteen he wished to go to sea but failed to get the consent of his mother and went back to the study of mathematics for a period of two years. This was not his only school. His brother Lawrence lived at Mount Vernon. He was fourteen years the senior, had fought with Vernon at Carthage, had been educated in England. In the autumn of 1747 Washington took up his work with his brother to whose home came the most distinguished men of Virginia. Here Washington met Lord Fairfax, a man of wide experience, familiar with court and camps, versed in literature and possessed of abundant wealth. The boy and the man became fast friends. They hunted and fished and rode together. This boy, a stripling of sixteen, won the confidence of this old man to the extent that he went into the wilderness to survey his vast estate. This at an age when most boys are but children.

That first journey into the wilderness was a rough but a wholesome experience. Walking by day throughout the stillness of the never ending forest, sleeping by night under the silent stars, wet, cold, hungry, tired, but never discouraged, it was the school that should prepare him for the bitter experience at Valley Forge, the weary waiting time till the clouds should roll away at Yorktown. Through it all he was thrown upon his own resources. This taught him self reliance. He was never a student of books, though he read well and much more than he was given credit for doing. He was above all a student of things and of men and no doubt learned much from the conversation of his elders.

Three years were spent in these surveys when the declining health of his brother Lawrence led to his going with him to the West Indies in 1751. The new and strange experiences were closely studied and stowed away in his mind to be used when he should stand before the world as the type that could found a free State. Thus once and but once did he leave the land of his birth. Travel in foreign lands contributed nothing to his knowledge of men and institutions.

When two converging armies, jealous and hostile, meet a battle is inevitable. The French had gone up the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes, had penetrated the continent to the sources of the Mississippi, moved down that river to its mouth. Forts were built and settlements were formed. The soldier, the trapper, the trader and the priest had taken possession of the heart of the continent for the King of France. The English settlements were confined to the narrow seaboard ranging in width from fifty to two hundred and fifty miles. Not until 1749 did the English look over the Blue Ridge into the rich valley of the Ohio. At the same time the French began to move south from the Eastern end of Lake Erie. The struggle was inevitable.

Lawrence Washington saw the impending war. He brought two old companions in arms to Mount Vernon that they might teach his brother to become a soldier. Muse instructed Washington in the art of war, tactics and the manual of arms, while Jacob Van Braam, a Dutch soldier of fortune, instructed him in fencing and sword exercise. At the same time though Washington was but nineteen, his brother secured for him the appointment as one of the Adjutant Generals of Virginia with the rank of Major. His military academy was two old soldiers. His diploma was a Major's commission in the Virginia militia.

At twenty-one he made that diplomatic mission to the Indians whom he was to conciliate, and to the French whom he was to warn. Van Braam and Christopher Gist were with him. At Logotown he was joined by the leaders of the Indians who accompanied him to Venango, the first French out-post. Then he pushed forward 70 miles to the Fort on French Creek where he delivered his letter from the Governor of Virginia. At Venango, at French Creek and at Venango again on their return, every means the wily French could employ was used to separate the Indian Chiefs from the party. Rum was freely used but not till on the return trips did the French prevail. So well had the work been done that the Half King remained

true to allegiance with the English. Washington and Gist returned on foot, exposed to hostile Indians, plunging through swollen streams filled with floating ice and sleeping on the ground with their clothes frozen to them.

On the return Washington encountered a company carrying materials for the building of a Fort at the mouth of the Ohio. Settlers were being scalped on their little holdings by Indians, incited by the French. The war was on and, though started in the backwoods of America, it was destined to extend to the continent of Europe and involve the leading nations of the world.

Through that war came the decision as to whether the fairest portion of America was to receive the civilization of the Latin or the Anglo-Saxon, whether the settlement should be of the type of soldier, trader, trapper and priest, or of the English type; the town, the school and the church. The future civilization of a continent was at stake. This boy of twenty-one was soldier and diplomat in the opening of that struggle.

Events crowd in his life, Fort Necessity, Braddock Field, the defense of the frontier, Loudon's failure, the expedition under Forbes. Through the years there is activity always, sometimes a smarting sense of injustice, rebukes by Dinwiddie. He became harassed and discouraged believing that his best endeavors failed of their just reward. He sickened under it all and was compelled to retire to Mount Vernon for four months.

Here at least Washington is human; stung by criticism, jealous of his good name, resenting the stories of misconduct, magnifying the little into the big. Here at least, he walks with us of common mold. He was essentially human in another respect. His love affairs were numerous. If he was an intense fighter, he was also an intense lover. His love affairs began as early as fourteen. The lowland beauty of his diary is but one of many. That he should fall in love early and often until he finally married in 1759, makes him a man after the heart of us all. The planter succeeded the soldier, but he

was more than planter. He was legislator, business man, man of affairs, counselor, leader.

The effort to-day has been to hold your minds to the formative period of his life. And while we have thus spoken no doubt there has been within mind and heart another with him. No man can speak of either without thinking of the other. Washington and Lincoln are inseparably connected. Others may imitate, none can equal. They stand alone. "Modern democracy never reached them." Great men defy analysis. There is an indefinable element that eludes us. We can only refer them to their class. There is but one class, no sub-class. Yet a study of the difficulties encountered enables us to place an estimate upon the degree in which we are willing to assign the element of greatness. Washington and Lincoln, "like splendid temples send their spires high and touch all other men at their highest." Through what quaking bogs did they dig the foundations of their fame! Through what mists did the spires of the splendid temple of their lives arise to the view of an admiring world! Washington was the founder of a nation, Lincoln its savior. Both faced ruin and achieved success.

Will you bear with me while we survey the circumstances under which these men wrought? Washington led in the struggle of thirteen weak, unorganized colonies against the greatest military power in the world. There was no navy. There was no army. There were no arms. One half of the people were tories. Without ships, without soldiers, without munitions, without money, with the world of thought against the principles of democracy, with no central government, it was his to hold the colonies together by the success of his arms, the wisdom of his judgment and the integrity of his purpose.

When the war was over and there was imminent danger that the fabric, so loosely woven together, would be torn asunder, it was the weight of his name that determined whether the warp put into the fabric should be strong enough to hold the loose strands together. The

Virginia convention would never have adopted the Constitution, had it not been for the influence of Washington. The majority in its favor was only ten, two voted against their instructions, and eight against the known feelings of their constituents. Washington wrote, "It is nearly impossible for anybody not on the spot to conceive what the danger and delicacy of our position have been."

The battle did not end there, for that wonderful confidence which the people ever showed toward Washington made him the first president of the republic which he had founded. His choice of men for the first cabinet exhibits his masterly knowledge of the eternal fitness of things. No really great man is so blinded by partial judgments or partisan feeling as to choose incompetents or retain them under stress of great events.

Four men besides Washington are responsible for our present form of government. They are Hamilton, Marshall, Webster and Lincoln. Time forbids that I should speak of Hamilton, "who smote the rock of public credit and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth"; of Marshall who gave strength to the superstructure of the government by his decisions in harmony with the implied powers of the constitution; or of Webster, the statesman, who took up the gauntlet of debate thrown down by Hayne, and fixed forever in the mind of the American people the strength and majesty of the constitution. "Life's work well done, life's crown well won." They passed on.

The struggle was not yet over. Lincoln came, the emancipator. He spoke to some of you on yonder hill, "With malice toward none and with charity for all." He spoke. A listening world applauds. What manner of man is this, so strong, so gentle, so honest, so true, that though he be dead, yet speaks to us to-day?

In 1857, more than fifty years after the death of Washington, Lord McCauley wrote a friend in America, "Your constitution is all sail and no anchor. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your republic will be fearfully



plundered and laid waste by the barbarians of the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country by your own institutions." He further states, "I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic will sooner or later destroy liberty or civilization, or both." Thus the foremost historian and statesman of England characterizes our experiment in government as doomed to failure. This judgment was held no doubt by the ruling class of England and the continental countries of Europe.

The revolution of 1848 had passed over France and "had left a despotism, a silent tribute, and an enslaved press." "Liberty was gone but civilization was saved." The world did not hope for the triumph of democracy. The verdict was in, so far as the judgment of those who ruled in Europe were concerned. They believed and taught that a free State has inherent weaknesses that will be its undoing. Majority rule as guaranteed by our constitution, was looked upon by every country of Europe as a dream of the well meaning visionary, but as a certain cause of ultimate ruin when the time of testing should come.

To-day our fleet at hand, our arsenals with all the munitions in them, the treasury full and running over into the laps of our allies, our people united, the prosecution of the war urged by all, no constitutional right of the government to reach out and lay its hands on the men of every State is questioned, no peace conventions in any State, no partisan press assailing President Wilson, a large part of the world allied with us and dependent upon us, the press of the world praising and not cursing, all the parties united to help and not hinder. If the problems of President Wilson are stupendous with a united people behind him, with three-fourths of the world in alliance with him, and with an almost inexhaustible supply of men and money available, what must have been the magnitude of the task set before Washington and Lincoln?

## ARTICLE III.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION AND  
THEIR RELATION TO MODERN MISSIONS.

BY REV. L. B. WOLF, D.D.

The Reformation of the 16th century wrought mighty changes in spheres of thought and life. The explanation of it has been sought in the desire for change, in the personal genius of a brilliant man, in the discovery of the art of printing, in the political disquiet of the times, in the triumph of reason over authority, and in the revival of learning. Better far is it to say that the Reformation came because a human soul longed for deliverance from the guilt and bondage of sin,—sought it in all the ways of the Church and found it not, but finally discovered it when he opened the Scriptures and read therein that the “Just shall live by Faith.” Briefly stated, the Reformation, however many occasions, had only one cause under God—that cause was the re-discovered Bible, God’s Word. We all agree that Christianity must dominate the world, for Christ must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet. What form of it is the question? That waits an answer. We are sure it will not be Roman, but Catholic. To be Catholic is to be universal; to be less than Catholic is to fail in the confession of Christ and the verities of Christianity. The Reformation of the 16th century was an effort to bring the Church back to an Apostolic confession of the Faith of Christ. Protestantism claims, and rightly so, that she confesses and will continue to confess in all lands that she is the bearer of the true Catholicity of Christ and His Apostles, both in fact and in solemn covenant. Her word has called her to carry to the ends of the earth that conception of the truth believed by the Apostles. Christ commanded them to hand it on to us. That part of the body of Christ that fails to exemplify in its life the clear teaching of Christ fails to

appreciate the clear command of Christ and does not believe in the certainty of the great evangelical principles for which the Protestant Church has ever stood since the Reformers bore their unfaltering testimony to the truth as it is in Jesus. Dr. Wace, the great Anglican, is most emphatic that we as Protestants must not give up the designation of Catholic. Canon Dixon states clearly his views. He holds "the opposite of Catholic is not Protestant but heretic; the opposite of Protestant is not Catholic but papist." Luther and the Reformers did not start a Protestant Church. They began a movement back to the Apostolic Church; back to the Church of the early fathers—away from Rome, away from the Pope and his supremacy as vicar of Christ.

Let us note how the word Protestant arose. The Reformation had almost past its first decade. The noble stand against Rome had been made, defiance had been nailed to the castle door at Wittenberg, the great Leipsic disputation (Eck, Carlstadt and Luther) had taken place, the Papal Bull and decretals had been burned outside of the little town of Wittenberg, the great defense had been delivered at Worms, the translation of the New Testament in the tongue of the people had been published broadcast, the ban of excommunication had been uttered when the Emperor summons the estates of the realm to the diet of Spires in 1526. He rebuked the nobles and princes for failing to carry out his imperial edict in the holy Roman Empire and putting an end to Luther and his set. He hoped a happy unity would result from this meeting. But the Pope and Emperor disagreed and no strong papal advance against the Reformers was possible. But an advantage was gained by the evangelical princes. The Emperor granted them the liberty "To live, govern, and personally act as each might hope and trust to answer for himself before God and the imperial majesty." The edict of Worms against Luther and the Reformers remained. They continued their work under a recognized right of the Emperor, that the princes had secured. In matters of faith and religion the Emperor

agreed they might act as they saw fit till he could look into them more carefully. In short, the ban against the truth of the Reformation was held in abeyance, and the law and decree of the supreme ruler remained imperative.

Three years later at the second diet at Spires matters assumed a much more serious form. The estates of the realm were summoned and the princes came together under new circumstances. The Pope and the Emperor had come to an understanding. The latter was pledged "To use all possible endeavors to resist the pestilential disease of Lutheranism and bring back to the true Church those who were in error." The fight was no longer between the Pope and his counsellors and the poor monk and his followers; it had become a battle royal between the noble evangelical princes and Empire and the Roman Hierarchy. Luther's simple appeal had won a way for itself. On their part the evangelical princes came to this second diet bearing their watchword, "The Word of the Lord endureth forever,"—the rallying cry of the Reformation. The Emperor accused them of failing to carry out his imperial will. He demanded that all the authorities then met should without delay repress all religious innovations. Although some protested, a resolution was carried that the edict of Worms should be immediately executed that "the horrible doctrine of the sect permitted since the edict should at once cease within their domain, and that other matters would be settled at a general council which was soon to be called." The majority agreed to this, but the minority would not. It drew up on April 20th, 1529, a protest and thus the evangelical princes became the first Protestants in the Reformation of the 16th century. The estates of the Empire made the fight and claimed their legal standing for the evangelical principles on this great field day of the Reformation. The Church historian Griselar sets forth this protest in great fullness, the heart of which is that the evangelical princes declared themselves ready to obey the Emperor in all other points except "In matters which touched and concerned

God's honor, and the salvation and eternal life of the souls of each one of us." For the sake of consciences "We hold this view and we cannot in such a matter give way to the majority." Besides they plead that at the previous council in the matter then at issue they had unanimously agreed to the matters submitted by the Emperor and that now the minority asks a similar unanimous vote in order to change what had been then allowed. They made their appeal "to and before the Roman Imperial and Christian Majesty, our Lord, and to and before the forthcoming Christian Council, and further before seeing competent impartial judges in these matters." As the eminent Carl Von Hase declares this protest is an assertion that there are obligations against which no positive legal right has any force, "as in matters of conscience there can be no question of majorities." In this lies the essence of Protestantism. This was its first claim to legal standing. Here no protest was made against the Roman Church, but the Reformers declared that they acted in obedience to what they regarded the teaching of the Word of God, their supreme authority and according to their conscience enlightened by that Word. This historical concrete exemplification is a most admirable exposition of the first great principle of the Reformation.

How it came to possess the evangelical princes and the people in that early time and passed into history the life of the Reformer abundantly shows.

In the famous library of Erfurt there lay one of those splendidly illuminated copies of the Word of God. Loving conservators of the Divine Word in those dark days had purchased and placed it there. One day in the midst of fear and with distressed mind, a pale student stops before it. He had been seeking for peace of conscience. He opened the great Book. Before that time he had read the books of the school. He had read the missal of the Church, but as he opened the Book his eyes fell upon the beautiful story of Samuel. It fixed his attention. Day after day he returns to the Book until the Bible, the Word of God, became to him the lamp of life, and in it he

saw his Saviour and Lord and found peace. Luther was then scarcely more than 18 years of age. By and by he became professor at Wittenberg. The Augustinian monk begins to teach in the university, to preach in the castle church and to discover soon that Rome and God's Word are strongly at variance in their teachings. By nailing up the 95 Theses he awakens discussion, and by that one act, challenges the authority of the Church and the State, a State dominated and controlled by the Church. He hastened on, and April 17th, 1521, is not far off. On that day the monk is asked to recant. His books lie around him and in the presence of the Emperor and the Papal legate he seems over-awed. His life is in great jeopardy. As with Hus so it might go with him. But God was with him and opened his mouth. When the final test was put to him, the poor monk was not found wanting. The great formal principle of the Reformation found utterance in his final words which are the *magna charta* and should be written in gold. "Unless I am convinced by testimonies of the Scripture or by evident reasoning—for I neither believe the Pope nor the Councils alone since it is clear that they have often erred and contradicted one another—I am overcome by the Scriptures I have quoted and my conscience is taken captive by the words of God and I neither can nor will recant anything, since it is neither safe nor right to act against conscience." This embodies the great formal principle of the Reformation stated by the individual.

Well does the great Anglican historian referring to this event say: Luther declares in this that the only authorities which he recognized as having binding obligations upon his conscience were the Word of God and evident reason. In short he declared that the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, the Word of God, was the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

The evangelical princes, as we noted above, extended this principle from the individual to the State and to the community. Under the supreme guidance and authority of God's Word, and not yielding in such matters to any

human authority or majority the world saw a new light; a new conception of the truth had dawned. History shows what happened to the reformer after the brave assertion of this principle. He is waylaid by his friends to save him from his enemies. He is concealed in the Wartburg for months. It is then he performs that signal task for Christianity by which he exemplifies his belief in the formal principle for which he stood. In the incredible short period of three months he translates the New Testament into the language of the common people and forever set seal to the principle for which the princes claimed legal right. Thus the formal reformation principle is brought to the level of the German nation.

Referring to the Protestant exemplification of this formal principle someone has lately said that the difference between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Church is this: that the former has thought God's Word too precious to be put into the vulgar language of the common people, while the latter has regarded it so precious that it must be put into the language of the rudest tribe.

But this great central principle performed its task only when the Word of God was released and bore its blessed message to all men. "The Bible like sunshine bursting through the clouds poured its life upon the nations." It is not wrong to call the Reformation period the period of the re-discovered Bible. It showed Luther how to become a Christian and then how to effect the great and needed reformation. "As with him, so with his noble co-worker Melancthon, with Zwingli in Switzerland, at a later period with Calvin in France, with Tindale and Cranmer in England, and with Knox in Scotland." "The Word of God was the fire that purified them into Christians—the man who becomes a Christian was already unconsciously a reformer." (Krauth).

The Reformers knew where their strength lay. They saw that under God their ability to sustain their cause was reliance on the supreme and absolute authority of God's Word on all questions of religion and conscience. This is fundamental.



But the devoutest Reformers did not stop with this statement of the formal principle. They worked out and laid down another equally fundamental one. Man is a sinner whose guilt oppresses him. He must find freedom from it if he is to have peace of mind. How shall he be just before his Maker. Luther had tried all those human ways in the monk's cell, and yet his soul cried out for peace. The history of the Church is a continued, heroic effort of the devout to obtain freedom from the guilt and bondage of sin. The Church's system was bankrupt. Comfort and hopes were gone. All ways seemed closed. Saints and teachers had tried human powers to their utmost, but the way of hope remained. It was the way of Christ and His Cross. The Reformers set forth this great principle when they said that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits or works, but are gratuitously justified for Christ's saks through faith; when they believe that they are received into favor and that their sins are remitted for Christ's sake who made satisfaction for our transgressions by His death. This faith God accepts for righteousness before Him. Here is the great material principle of the Reformation announced first on June 25th, 1530, at Augsburg. It has been more or less fully accepted by the whole evangelical Church. It is cardinal in the Christian system that Jesus came, suffered and died for our sins and to secure our forgiveness. It is most material that the soul should by faith apprehend His merits and sacrifice. The Reformer's teaching is that Christ's sacrifice is absolutely sufficient as a satisfaction for sin. Pardon cannot be merited, it is gratuitously bestowed by a gracious God. You may reject it, or you can by faith take it as a rich gift, and then your relation to God is all changed through your acceptance of Him and His salvation. Such a vast blessing as depends on faith alone in Jesus Christ.

It might be objected that this seems to elevate faith into a virtue, but mark the teaching of the Church of the Reformation in regard to God's Word. This great blessing is not offered on the mere exercise of human faith.

It is offered for Christ's sake and becomes our conscious possession through faith which is the gift of God. The Reformers do not say as you often hear it said, that we are justified by faith, but they said we are justified for Christ's sake through faith. Besides faith is not simply mere knowledge (the devils have that) but it is trust as well in a gracious Father who sets burdened hearts free, nay, it is God's seeking and saving the lost through His Son and it is the soul's acceptance of His gracious promise through faith.

The Great truths then of the Reformers are plain; that God in Christ Jesus has reconciled the world unto Himself; that while it is true that the soul that sinneth must die it is most true that Jesus Christ has on the cross made a complete perfect satisfaction for the sin of the world, that God, the Triune receives the faith of the believer for Christ's sake as an all sufficient guarantee of pardon, and grants him peace. God's Word amply provides for all this, and by His Word alone men are directed into this saving faith.

It is evident that a Reformed Church must be a preaching Church and a missionary Church, to the ends of the earth. This is not only or solely its evident purpose, because of the command of Jesus so to do, but as well is it called to this because of the great truths which believers have to impart to a needy and dying world.

The first relation which this reformed Church has set up in the non-Christian world by which it exemplified the great reformation principle is to be found in the ways in which it has handled the Word of God. The first evangelical missionary no sooner acquires the language of the people among whom he labors than he begins to translate the Bible into the vernacular. During the last 200 years the Word of God has been translated into over 500 languages and dialects, and these versions have been circulated by the million.

Within the last two years St. Mark's Gospel has been translated into the tongue of a most insignificant tribe. It has been estimated that not less than four-fifths of all

the inhabitants of the world have opened to them the Word of God in their own tongue. What a mighty testimony to the influence of the great formal principle, the absolute supremacy of the Scriptures in matters of faith and religion is not this! The evangelical Churches have done a work that in and of itself is one of the mightiest influences exerted upon the nations to-day, in transforming them and changing their thought and life. So effectively has this reformation principle been carried out in the mission lands that we have hardly stopped to express our gratitude and thanks to the Reformers for the mighty emphasis which they laid on this principle and for the practical manner in which in reformation days they translated the Scriptures into all the languages of Europe.

The second great relation which the Reformers set up in the missionary work was the character of their preaching, which they largely drew from the teaching of evangelical Christianity as it found expression in the great doctrines of Christ, the sinner's hope in his Redeemer and peace of conscience through Him. Wherever they went they confessed that men are not saved, except on the merits and atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ through whom they are received into God's favor.

Rome has done since the 16th century a mighty missionary work in her own way, as testify the missions in every land in the Orient. There is no need now to judge her work more than to say that in her use of the Word and Sacraments, in her insistence upon the authority of the Church, in her failure to apprehend the faith of Jesus she is the same Church as in the days of the Reformers. She cannot claim either to be evangelical or Catholic, she is still papist. It is true she is struggling to adapt her methods to changing modern, social and economic programs, but her Gospel is not the Apostolic Gospel, not Jesus only, not a burdened soul freed through Christ. Her errors have not been cast off, but rather emphasized since they were crystalized at the Council of Trent. She relates her missionary propaganda to her ecclesiastical

system against which the reformers uttered their noble protest. She does not relate her work to an evangelical program.

We may well emulate her self-sacrificing endeavor and the zeal of her missionaries, but not her method, much less her message to the non-Christian world. The evangelical missionary has a task handed to him by the Reformation, to preach Christ Jesus and Him crucified in school and college, in village and hospital, in workshop and in field, and everywhere. The missionary must preach that the sinner is justified by faith in Christ and that this faith comes through a faithful use of the means of grace, the Word of God and the Sacraments. He must preach that this faith will result in a life of good works and that the devout souls will at length stand complete in Him who alone justifies and saves. The evangelical Churches cannot afford in view of these great reformation principles to do anything less than to honor God's Word and preach His justifying faith to the Gentiles.

Too often it may be that the awful social condition and physical needs of the great non-Christian world may so make their appeal to the missionary, (and they have made it to many) that he gets so immersed in a great and fine social program as to forget the chief concern for which he went to Africa, India, China, Japan or the Islands of the Sea. Let such an one remember that had our Reformers in the 16th century given themselves to a social program in their day or to an educational or medical one they would have found a field of awful needs which those times revealed such as hardly now exists in any part of the heathen world. Had they however, done this it is doubtful whether we would have had a Gospel to-day to preach. We would not say a word against all secondary missionary methods as embraced in medicine, in school, in college, in industrial work, in agricultural work, but we would simply make a most earnest plea that the first things must be kept first, and that the great fundamental principles, which have wrought such marked changes in and since the 16th century may never be given a second-

ary place in any of the plans or policies of an evangelical Board of Missions.

Our hope in the lands beyond lies in our loyalty to the fundamental principles of the Reformers, and the more closely we relate ourselves to them, the sooner and the more effectively will men be brought to clear thinking in their relation to God in Christ and toward one another in the great human brotherhood. The compelling power of Christ and His perfect life and sacrificial death must change all life and through Him our justifying Saviour this world shall be made new.

The forces of the Christian Church may and should have the highest and best training for their great and arduous task. As in the time of the Reformers the school and the university may and should be utilized to equip the evangelizing agencies, the men and the women to carry on this mighty undertaking committed to the Church. The Church of Christ should cease in its various parts and denominations, from building altar against altar in the heathen world; the Boards should see that this work does not overlap and trench on the field and work of others who are preaching the evangelical faith; the missionaries may and should engage in every matured method of winning the great Gentile world, and then continue to study to know yet better and more approved methods in their great unfinished task; but as the reformed principles accomplished such remarkable change and wrought so mightily in the past it can only be as the missionary forces follow them and closely relate themselves to them that certain victory promised in God's Word is sure to be gained.

Only as the Church at home and through her missionaries confesses that there is only one perfect rule of faith and practice, only one absolute guide book and historical revelation of God to man, only as they see Jesus and preach Him to the Gentile world, only as He is set forth as very God of very God, begotten not made, who for us and for our salvation came down from Heaven and was incarnate of the Virgin Mary, only as faith in His name

and in none other is made known—only as God's plan is followed that men are freely justified for Christ's sake through faith, can this stupendous task be accomplished. The Reformation principles were formed in a long sin-sick, tempest tossed soul before they were released and began to conquer the forces against them in the 16th century. They must again hold in full sway human hearts and control human lives in this 20th century and mighty things will be undertaken for man and for God and mighty victories will be won in Christ's name and strength.

In conclusion, conformity of method in work on the foreign field is good; striving for unity and emphasizing our common aim is most praiseworthy: but neither conformity nor unity necessarily exemplifies Christ's truth or hastens the coming of His Kingdom. The only effective unity is in the love, and power and faith of His Gospel unto salvation through His atoning sacrifice. The Church must be united in a common faith to secure the realization of the prayer of our Lord.

Let us learn the Reformation lesson, that not in a common task mainly, but in a common faith fundamentally and essentially can true unity be attained and through such unity ultimate victory won.

*Baltimore, Md.*

## ARTICLE IV.

ANTICIPATIONS OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN  
THE WRITINGS OF HEATHEN AND JEWISH  
PHILOSOPHERS.

BY PROFESSOR J. M. HANTZ.

It is not until its second epoch, which commences with Socrates and culminates in Plato and Aristotle, that Greek Philosophy can be said to have any direct or conscious relation to Theology. The Materialism of the early Ionians is indeed condemned by Cudworth as an atheistical philosophy; (*Intellectual System*, Vol. I, p. 182, ed. Harrison); and the rival system of Parmenides, on the one hand, and Hiraclitus, on the other, furnish the type and principle of the two methods of reasoning, one or other of which underlies all the later developments of Pantheism; namely, that which, starting from the idea of Rest, regards the Deity as a universal Substance, and that which, starting from the idea of Motion, represents the Divine Nature in the form of a universal Process. Yet to speak of these systems as actually atheistic or pantheistic, would be to introduce into them an idea which was not present to the minds of their authors, and which cannot with justice be regarded as having had an influence in their formation. To the mind of a Greek philosopher of this period, an inquiry into the origin of the universe was something wholly different from a speculation concerning the nature and mode of action of the Deity. The God of his religion, whether regarded as one or many, was not the source and first principle of all things,—the Supreme Being of all was not the earliest in point of existence. (*Aristotle, Metaph. XIV 4*). To a philosophy which had its precursor in a mythical Theogony, there was nothing absurd or incongruous in the idea of a created Deity, and to refer the source of the universe to a material element or to a metaphysical ab-



straction was quite compatible with the acknowledgment of a personal Being as the object of worship and the arbiter of the welfare of mankind. A germ of conscious Theism on the one side and of conscious Atheism on the other, may perhaps be traced in the subsequent speculations of Anaxagoras and Leucippus; but the growth of each was speedily checked by the universal scepticism of the Sophistic period; and the idea of God as the source of all existence and the summit of all philosophical speculation can hardly be said to have assumed a definite place in philosophy till a new phase of thought was inaugurated by Socrates and carried on by his two great successors.

The germ, as I have already observed, of a theistic philosophy may be found in the teaching of Anaxagoras. That philosopher was the first to perceive that the formation of a mundane system out of chaos must be referred, not to merely material forces, but to the action of intelligence working with design; a step so far in advance of all previous speculations, that its author, in the remarkable language of Aristotle, appears among his predecessors as the one sober man among a crowd of disorderly babblers. (Arist. *Metaph.* I, 3, 16). "Intelligence," said the philosopher of Clazomenae, "is infinite and independent, and is not mingled with any other thing. . . . It is the subtlest and purest of all things, and power over all things. It governs all things that have life, both great and small, and it governs the revolution of the universe which it set in motion at the beginning. . . . and the things that are mingled and separated and divided were all known to Intelligence; and the same Intelligence ordered all things which were to be, and which were, and whatever things now are, and what will be hereafter, and the revolutions in which move the stars, and the sun, and the moon, and the lower and upper air, which were formed by the separation." (Anaxagoras *Fragm.* VI, ed. Schom).

The sublime conception, thus introduced for the first time with Greek philosophy, well merits the encomium

of Aristotle, and marks out its author as having laid the foundation of the theological edifice which his successors were destined to erect. But it was left for the practical mind of Socrates to give this noble philosophical utterance a distinctly religious application, by identifying this presiding Intellect with the God to whom worship is due, and seeing in the adaptation of nature to the needs of man an evidence of the providential purpose of a Being who cares for man. In the remarkable conversation with Aristodemus, recorded in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, Socrates uses the language of monotheism, speaking of God as "He who in the beginning made man; he sees in the constitution of man evidences of the care and goodness of his Maker, in disposing his several faculties, bodily and mental, for his benefit, and implanting in his soul a belief in God and a sense of religious duty; and he infers that as the mind of man governs his body, so the divine intellect which presides over the universe disposes all things according to its pleasure; and that the limited powers of man are a type of the unlimited power and wisdom of God, who is everywhere present, seeing all things. In another conversation, recorded in the same work, (That with Enthydemus, Xen. Mem. IV, 3) he speaks indeed in a similar manner of a plurality of Gods who are to be worshipped and honored as manifested in their works, though unseen themselves; but the very language in which he distinguishes these subordinate deities from the Supreme Ruler and Sustainer of the whole world, seems to show that he is rather adapting his teaching to the capacity of his hearers than giving an exact statement of his own belief. The pervading thought in the theology of Socrates is that of a supreme divine Providence, to which other deities may possibly be subordinate (the incongruity in the idea of a subordinate Deity being such as few Greek minds could discern at all and which even to a Socrates would not be fully perceptible) but which, as exercised by the one Supreme Ruler of the world, forms a direct relation between God and man as master and servant, benefactor and receiver of

benefits, and thus brings into prominence the two fundamental ideas upon which the possibility of a religious relation depends,—the Personality of God and the Personality of Man. The Supreme Being, acting with design in the constitution of the world and the providential government of his creatures, must necessarily be conceived as a power; and man, whose intellectual and moral qualities constitute his resemblance to the Deity, and the purpose and well-being of whose life is to strive after the highest intellectual and moral excellence as the imitation of God, is necessarily conceived as a person also, not as in the older Greek philosophy, merely as a part of the universe, a phenomenon to be explained like other phenomena by physical or mathematical or metaphysical principles. This vivid consciousness of the true character of man as a person and not a thing, as a moral agent, not as a natural phenomenon, appears also as the groundwork of the same philosopher's belief in the immortality of the soul; if we separate the practical form of belief as probably held by Socrates himself from the metaphysical hypothesis with which it is connected in the more elaborate system worked out by Plato. The arguments which are put into the mouth of Socrates in the *Phaedo*,—the production of opposites from opposites, the pre-existence and reminiscence of a former life, the simplicity and indivisibility of the soul—are too intimately connected with the later development of Plato's own philosophy to be received as the actual words of the dying Socrates; and this conclusion is confirmed, if confirmation is needed, by the very different language in which the same belief is expressed not only in the representation of Xenophon but in the Platonic *Apology*—a work which probably reproduces with tolerable fidelity the actual defence made by Socrates himself before his judges. With Socrates, the conviction of the immortality of the soul was rather a religious belief than a philosophical tenet,—a belief rendered probable by the popular traditions, by the divine nature of the soul, and by the care which God has for man; but not deduced from any specu-

lative principle. "For a good man," he says, "no event can be evil, whether he lives or dies, seeing that his concerns are never disregarded by the Gods. Nor does what now happens to me happen without purpose on their part; for I am persuaded that it is better for me to die, and to have done with the things of this world." (Plato, *Apol.*, p. 41; translated by Whewell, *Platonic Dialogues* I, p. 330). A development from a Christian point of view, of the same evidence of man's immortality, as derived from his personality and personal relation to God, may be seen in the striking comment of Neander on the text, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." "How," he says, "could God place Himself in so near a relation to individual men (to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) and ascribe to them so high a dignity, if they were mere perishable appearances; if they had not an essence akin to His own, and destined for immortality? . . . The living God can only be conceived as the God of the living. And this argument, derived from the theocratic basis of the Old Testament, is founded upon a more general one, viz: the connection between the consciousness of God and that of immortality. Man could not become conscious of God as his God, if he were not a personal spirit, divinely allied, and destined for eternity; and an eternal object (as an individual) of God; and thereby far above all material and perishable being, whose perpetuity is that of the species, not of the individual." (*Life of Christ*, p. 399; Bohn's Translation).

In passing from Socrates to Plato, we pass at once, by an almost abrupt transition, from the moralist to the metaphysician. The transition would be yet more abrupt, were it not for the part which Socrates is made to play in the Platonic Dialogues, sometimes as the exponent of his own genuine philosophy, sometimes as the mere vehicle of communication for the higher abstraction which the disciple has engrafted on the homely and practical teaching of his master. In the later writings of Plato, in which his own philosophy is most fully developed and most clearly distinguishable from that of Socrates, we

find for the first time the conception of a Personal God, imperatively demanded by the moral and religious consciousness, confronted with that of an absolute First Principle of thought and existence, to which it is the aim of metaphysical speculation to attain; we find the mind of the philosopher wavering between the two, seeking to identify one with the other, yet partially conscious of a discrepancy between them. This uncertainty is most conspicuous when we compare the language of the *Republic* with that of its sequel the *Timaeus*. In the former dialogue the metaphysical view preponderates; and it contains the germ of the most important of those speculations and hypotheses concerning the absolute nature of God which have ever since penetrated and leavened philosophical theology both in heathen and in Christian times.

The two types prescribed at the close of the Second Book for the representation of God; namely, first, that He is not the author of all things, but only of that which is good, not of that which is evil; and, secondly, that, as being perfect, He cannot change from his perfection, but must abide absolutely forever in the same form, contain the first distinct statement of two great problems of philosophical theology, which have remained unsolved in all subsequent ages—the origin of evil, and the relation of power to act in the Divine Nature. From the former of these springs that representation of evil as a *privation* or a *negation* instead of a positive entity which is as prominent in the writings of the Christian Fathers (Ref. in Muller, E. T., I, p. 312), as well as the bolder speculations of pantheists like Spinoza, who regard evil as a mere delusive appearance caused by the imperfection of our faculties, and optimists like Leibnitz, who treat it as an indispensable accompaniment of the best possible world. To the latter is due that representation of God as pure act without any potentiality, which descended from Plato to Aristotle, and from both to the Fathers and the Schoolmen, which is adopted as an heirloom of Catholic Theology by our great Anglican Divines, though attacked by

the sneers of empirical philosophy in the seventeenth century and of self-reliant reconstructors of Theology in the eighteenth. Less cautiously employed, the same representation gave rise to the speculations of Hermogenes, censured by Tertullian,—which maintained the necessity of an eternal matter, to be subject to the eternal government of God; (Tertullian *adv. Hermogenem* C. 3) and those of Origen, combated by Methodius, concerning the eternal *becoming* of a spiritual creation, commensurate with the eternal activity of the Creator. (Origen, *De Princ.*, I, 2, 10, Cf. Neander, *Church Hist.*, II, p. 281). Still more does this apparent discrepancy between the religious and the philosophical conception of the Supreme Being appear in a later passage of the *Republic*, in which Plato endeavors to depict, imperfectly and approximately, the nature of the highest good, the source of all existence and all knowledge. That this chief good, the idea of good, must be identified with the Deity, is manifest; for were it otherwise God Himself could only be good in a secondary and derived sense, through participation of the idea, the latter being the only true and absolute goodness, and therefore the true Deity. (See Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, Vol. I, p. 309. Some other expositors of Plato deny that the idea of good can be identified with God. Cf. Martin *Etudes sur le Timée*, I, p. 10, and Retzig *Αἰτία* in *Philebus* die Personliche, Gottheit des Plato, Bern 1866. The majority of modern critics, however, identify the two). In this sense Plato is certainly understood by those Christian Fathers who adopt his language concerning the chief good, as not substance but transcending substance in dignity and power, (ὅκ οὐσίας ὄντος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ἀλλ' ἔτι ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας πρεσβεία καὶ δυνάμει ὑπερχοντος) to express the absolute and incomprehensible nature of God. Thus St. Athanasius, following Plato almost word for word speaks of as above all substance and human thought (ὁ ὑπερέκεινα πάσης οὐσίας καὶ ἀνθρωπίνης ἐκείνης ὑπάρχων) (C. *Gentes* c. 2. Cf. Greg. Nazianz. *Orat.* XII, p. 198. Καλλίστον μὲν τῶν ὄντων καὶ ὑψηλότατον θεός ἐστι μὴ τῷ φίλῳ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῇν οὐσίαν ἀγεν ἑαυτόν. Cf. Petanus,

*De Deo*. I, 6, vi. 1, 3), while later theologians rising higher still and adopting the language of Plotinus rather than of Plato, speak of the Divine Nature as transcending existence itself. (Maximus in Dionys. *De Dio Nom.* C. 5. Τὸ ὃν ἐπὶ τοῦ θεοῦ λεγόμενον ὅλου συλλήβδην τοῦ εἶναι ὑπέρεστι. Joann Damarc, *De Fide Orthod.* 1, 4. 'Οὐδέν γὰρ τῶν ὄντων ἐστὶν ὅυχ ὡς μὴ ὢν, ἀλλ' ὡς ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ ὄντα καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι ὢν. So Plotinus *Ennead*, v. 1, 10. τὸ ἐπέκεινα ὄντος τὸ ἐν.

The commencement of the discussion in the *Timaeus* seems like a continuation of the same view. Just as in the *Republic*, the philosopher declines to give any description of the Chief Good in itself, but contents himself with illustrating it by imperfect similarities, so in the *Timaeus* he commences with the memorable declaration, "the Maker and Father of the Universe is difficult to discover and when discovered impossible to express"—a declaration frequently repeated by Christian writers, either literally (see Stallbaum on *Timaeus* l. c.) or in the still more developed form maintained by Gregory Nazianzen; "a theologian among the Greeks has said in his philosophy that to conceive God is difficult, to express Him is impossible. But I say that it is impossible to express Him, and more impossible to conceive Him." But as the dialogue proceeds, the action of the Deity in the formation of the world is described in language distinctly denoting an intelligent and personal agent. "God," he says, "demiurge or artificer of the world, being good, and therefore exempt from envy, and desiring that all things should be like Himself, framed the visible world after the ideal pattern; and because that which has intelligence is better than that which has it not, therefore he created the world as an intelligent being, having a soul as well as a body. In the formation of the world, the Deity is said to act from *reason and design* (ἐκ λόγου καὶ διανοίας), *by intellect*, (διὰ νοῦ); and his action is spoken of as an *exercise of reason*, (λογισμός)." When the world was made, we are told that the father who made it admired it and was rejoiced; and subsequently, after describing the creation of time, of the planets, the measures



of time, and of the fixed stars, who are living beings, divine and everlasting, he proceeds to tell us how the Supreme Deity, having formed the souls of men, committed to those inferior deities the task of joining them to corruptible bodies. The mythical character of many of the details of this description has led some commentators to regard the whole as a mere popular and symbolical representation which cannot be regarded as expressing Plato's own belief; but we shall perhaps interpret it more truly if we suppose that the philosopher himself was possessed by two separate convictions, both of which he believed to be true, but which he was unable to combine into a single and consistent theory. On the one hand, he believed in a personal God, the Maker of the world; on the other, he was conscious that this conception fell short of the absolute first principle required by Dialectic. Hence, while he generally adapts the language of his philosophy to the former belief, he occasionally intimates the existence of a higher truth, which his thought tends towards, without being able to reach. "Plato," says Ackerman, "no more gives a definition of the Divine nature than does the Bible; for, according to him, we can only know the Divine essence by way of approximation and comparison. (*Christian Element in Plato*, p. 45, Eng. tr.) And he continues quoting from Ritter, "would that Plato's pupils and the later Platonists had only remained true to their great master in this respect, and had intimated his wise abstinence from any attempt to discover the idea of God or of goodness in its supra-substantial or supra-scientific unity. Believing that philosophy could and should proceed further on this point, they fell into many errors and extravagances." If this be true, and it is the view which gives the most natural and consistent interpretation to Plato's language, it will follow that the true spirit of the Platonic philosophy was more nearly represented by those Christian Fathers who, sometimes in the very language of Plato, asserted the incomprehensibility of the Divine Essence, than by the intuitional theosophy by which the Neo-Platonic school

sought to overlap the chasm which their master was unable to pass, and to soar upwards in ecstasy to a direct vision of the absolute. According to Plato himself, absolute knowledge, if attainable by man, at all, is to be attained not in this life, but in the next. "If even," he says in the *Phaedo*, "we are to know anything in purity, we must get rid of the body, and contemplate things as themselves by the soul itself; and then we should attain the wisdom which we seek; in death, as our reasoning shows, but not in life." (*Phaedo*, p. 66, e.) The Christian echo of these words with a fuller knowledge—and a more assured hope, may be heard in the words of Gregory Nazianzen. "What God is in His nature and essence, no man hath ever yet discovered, nor can discover. Whether he ever will discover it, let those who please inquire and speculate. In my opinion, he will then discover it, when this godlike and divine thing, I mean our intellect and reason, shall have mingled with that which is cognate to itself, and the image shall have ascended to the archetype of which it now has the desire." (*Orat.* xxxiv, *Opera*. 1630, Vol. I, p. 548).

Among the subordinate details of the theory of the *Timaeus*, it is necessary to notice one especially, which has been adopted, almost as an axiomatic principle, in the philosophy of Christian theologians. I allude to the theory of the creation of Time, and of the independence of the Divine nature of all distinction between past, present, and future. "Days, and nights, and months, and years," he says, "were not before the heaven was made, but the Deity planned their production together with it. All these are parts of time, and the past and the future are forms of time having a beginning. When we transfer these to the eternal substance, we err unconsciously; we speak of it, forsooth, as that which was, and is, and is to be; whereas in truth it is the only fitting mode of speech." (*Timeaus*, p. 37, 38). Here we have that representation of eternity as a *nunc stans*, a present without a past or future, which has been adopted almost universally by Christian divines from the days of Augustine

downwards, and was received as an established principle even by the Schoolmen, notwithstanding the opposite teaching of their great philosopher Aristotle. (Phys. Aris., VIII, 1).

On the other hand, it must be admitted, that the formation of the world, as described in the *Timeaus*, and the same may be said of all other theories formed independently of Scripture, is not a creation proper, a production out of nothing, wherein "things which are seen were not made of things that do appear"; It is rather the molding into order of a pre-existent formless matter, of which the Deity is not the creator but only the demiurge or artificer. The philosophy of Plato seems to recognize three original and eternal existences, first the Deity Demiurge of the visible world; secondly, the ideal world or archetype, after the pattern of which the visible world was framed, and, thirdly, the primitive matter out of which the world was formed; itself unformed and invisible, but susceptible of every variety of visible form. This recognition of a material principle not created by God is in harmony with the philosophy which asserts that God is not the author of all things, but only of those things that are good; it is an attempt to account for the origin of evil by referring it to an inert negative resistance to the will of the Deity which the Divine power is unable wholly to subdue; it is a duration contrasting an action with a passive principle, whose further development may be traced in the Alexandrian form of Gnosticism, as distinguished from the Persian dualism which assumes two active principles of good and evil respectively, whose influence may be traced in the Syrian forms of Gnosticism. (Cf. Neander, Church Hist., II, p. 13. Geiseler, I, p. 135).

The Platonic account of the relation of the world to God is expressed in language which exhibits a resemblance, and at the same time a contrast, to that of Scripture. "God," says Plato, "framed the visible world, being without envy, and desiring that all things should be like Himself." "God," says the Scripture, "created man in His own

image." (Cf. Hamme, *Die Idei der Absoluten Persönlichkeit*, I, p. 115). In the former, we recognize the thought of a noble spirit, conscious of a great truth, yet unable wholly to shake off the trammels of the erroneous method from which philosophy was only just beginning to emerge. The idea of personality, as the highest form of existence, as the one especial bond of relation between man and God, had dawned upon the mind of Greek philosophy, but had not yet attained to full daylight. The spirit of the older speculations, which sought after the causes and constitution of the universe, and regarded man only as a part of the universe, had been weakened, but was not yet extinct. The same spirit manifests itself again more directly, a generation later, in the language of Aristotle, "though man, the best of all animals, yet there are other things far more divine in their nature than man, such as are manifestly the elements of which the world is composed." (*Eth. Nic.*, VI, 7). From the day when Socrates called down philosophy from the sky, to place her in the cities and homes of men, the mind of Greece had begun to awaken to the conviction that man stood apart from the rest of the world, as a being of his own kind, and that the philosophy of man must be pursued on distinct principles by a distinct method from that of things in general, yet still the old prejudice remained, that it was inferior and subordinate to the latter. The true dignity of personality, the conviction that that which knows must be grander than that which is known, that which is free, than that which is constrained, broke faintly and occasionally through the mists of heathen philosophy, and maintained, at intervals and in the highest minds, a doubtful conflict with the pantheistic tendency which, latently or manifestly, pervades and perverts all speculative aspirations of man's natural reason after an absolute first principle; but the complete possession of this conviction, the entire assurance that personality, limited as it is in human consciousness, is yet the nearest type by which man can approach to an apprehension of the unlimited existence of God, the closest

approximation to an intuition of the real as distinguished from the apparent, is to be found only among those to whom the God of their fathers revealed himself under the name of I AM.

The same imperfect emancipation from the trammels of the older philosophy may be discerned in Plato's treatment of that religious doctrine of which he among all the philosophers of antiquity is pre-eminently the hierophant—that of the immortality of the soul. Firmly as the conviction of this great truth was implanted in the soul of Plato, he is never able to rise above the erroneous method of contemplating it as an *attribute* to be demonstrated of a *substance*. General and abstract principles, such as that simple substance cannot be dissolved, or that opposites spring out of each other, can have no real weight in establishing the truth of that which is true of the soul of man as a being *sui generis*, as a person not as a thing, and which therefore has no connection with any general principle of things. In justice to Plato, however, it must be said that his error is one which perhaps more than any other has descended uncorrected to Christian philosophy, even down to the present day. It is the one error which in the midst of marvellous acuteness in matters of detail, vitiates the foundation of the psychology of the Schoolmen. It is shared by Locke with his rival Leibnitz, and with his Scottish antagonists in the next century; it constitutes the weak point (a weakness perhaps necessitated by the ground which he had chosen) in the reasoning of Butler; it pervades in another form the materialism and semi-materialism of philosophers of the present day. All alike wander into the region of existence in general, in search of the abstract and remote conception of *spirit* or *mind*; when the witness of their own consciousness is close at hand to supply them with the concrete and immediate conception of a *person*. The climax of the method is to be found in that most suicidal of all paradoxes which, were it not for the great names of those by whom it has actually been adopted, one might have thought too transparently absurd to have been en-

tertained by any reasonable being—that I am conscious of my states of mind, and not of myself, the subject of those states.

Were we to confine our inquiry to those anticipations of distinct points of Christian doctrine which occur in the genuine writings of Plato, or even in all those which are popularly attributed to him, when interpreted in their natural sense, we might now conclude our enumeration; adding perhaps an additional remark on the general tendency of the Platonic philosophy, as distinguished from its definite doctrines—on the consciousness which it manifests though imperfectly of the corruption of human nature through the lusts of the flesh, and on its aim to awaken in the soul its latent consciousness of heavenly things, to raise it from the world of sense and sensible phenomena to that of the unseen and eternal realities, striving earnestly in the dimness of natural light to behold by the eye of faith. But among the definite Christian doctrines, of which anticipations have been attributed to Plato, there remains one which, though forced into his philosophy on spurious authority and by perverse interpretation, is yet too important, both theologically and historically, to be passed over without notice. I allude to the opinion generally received among Christian writers from the second century to the seventeenth, that in the Platonic philosophy may be found a distinct recognition of the divine mystery of a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead. The Fathers who adopted this view believed that Plato had obtained his knowledge of the doctrine from the partial revelations of it which may be gathered from the Jewish Scripture. (Beginning with Justin Martin, *Apol.* I, 60, and Clem. Alex. Strom, p. 255). But when this explanation became no longer tenable, the supposed affinity between Platonism and Christianity was wrested by writers like Gibbon to an opposite purpose, to insinuate suspicions against the divine origin of the Catholic Faith, by representing it as a possible development or perversion of the speculations of heathen philosophy. (See Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, Ch. XXI).

Both friends and enemies of Christianity, however, have expended their labor in vain; for in truth the supposed fact upon which their arguments are based rests upon evidence so slight and interpretations so arbitrary that the only marvellous thing about it is the general extent and long duration of the belief in its existence. If we except the inferences founded on a forced and wholly untenable interpretation of the terms λόγος and νοῦς which in Plato are simply used to denote attributes of mind, whether divine or human, without the slightest trace of a distinct personality, the direct evidence is reduced to two passages in the so-called Platonic Epistles—writings which the almost unanimous voice of modern criticism, with the distinguished but solitary exception of Mr. Grote, has pronounced to be spurious. (Cf. Thompson's note in W. A. Butler's *Lectures*, II, p. 16. The genuineness of the Epistles is also admitted by Martin *Etude sur la Timée*, Vol. II, p. 387, but without entering into the argument). But waving this question, let us see what the passages themselves, rating their authority at the highest, actually state. The Second Epistle, addressed to Dionysius, contains the following obscure sentence, the writer professing to speak in enigmas, that his words may be unintelligible if the latter should fall into other hands. "All things are aroused the king of all things, and all things for his sake; and he is the cause of all good things; and a second aroused the second things, and a third aroused the third things." δεύτερον δέ περὶ τα δευτερα, καὶ τριτον περὶ τὰ τρίτα. The sentence will be more in keeping with the first part if we change the accent of the preposition and read with Karsten τὸ δε δεύτερον πέρι τὰ δευτερα, καὶ τὸ τρίτον τέρι τὰ τρίτα "and the second things aroused the second principle, and the third aroused the third." Oedipus himself would scarcely venture to assign a definite meaning to such an oracle; but when we remember that Plato in the *Timaeus* (p. 52 A. Cf. Karsten *De Platonis quae veruntur Epistolis*, p. 209), applies the same epithets of *first*, *second* and *third* to the ideal world, the seventh world, and the



primitive matter, all related in different manners and degrees to the Supreme Good, the highest source of existence and knowledge, it is obvious that to seek a higher and more sacred meaning for the language of the Epistle, whether it be that of Plato himself, or of a disciple assuming his name, is to depart from the clue distinctly suggested by the Platonic philosophy itself, to seek for one to which that philosophy gives no countenance. The other passage, from the sixth Platonic Epistle is still less to the purpose. It is simply a valedictory conclusion in which the writer exhorts his correspondents to "swear" by the "God who is the leader of all things present and to come, and by the sovereign father of the leader and cause." The style of this farewell is anything but in Plato's manner, but the source of the matter may be clearly traced to the language of the *Timaeus*, in which God the demiurge is described as creating the world as a *second God*, to which he is a father; the world itself being the leader of a host of other deities formed by the same father. (Cf. Karsten, p. 211).

In truth, the so-called Platonic Trinity, far from being an anticipation by heathen philosophy of the doctrine of the Catholic Faith is, on the other hand, due to the influence of Christianity itself upon heathen philosophy; the later Platonists having borrowed and perverted the Christian doctrine, with the view of giving a higher significance to the writings of their master. The various forms which the doctrine assumed in the hands of various expositors is itself a proof of its foreign origin; each different interpreter attempting to distort the text of Plato in a different manner, to adapt it to an extraneous teaching, which it must somehow or other be shown to have anticipated. The earliest trace of such attempts, if indeed it is a trace, at all, in any heathen expositor of Plato, that of Alcinous cannot be placed earlier than the middle of the second century after Christ; and the most popular and generally received form is due to Plotinus in the third century. The first distinct statement of a Trinity, in the Christian sense to be found in Plato, is

undoubtedly due to Christian writers; the works of Justin Martyr, and even of Clement of Alexandria, being earlier than anything which can be attributed with any certainty of interpretation to a heathen philosopher. The mutual action of Christianity and Platonism on each other forms an interesting and important phase in the early history of the Church, to which I hope to be able to call your attention in a future course, but which cannot properly be classed among anticipations of Christian doctrine. An earlier phase of the same subject, the relation of Platonism to Judaism, will receive some notice in my next lecture.

The reputation of Plato will not really suffer by the abandonment of this ill-judged attempt to exalt his philosophy to a level with the Christian revelation,—an attempt which, whatever may have been its purpose in former ages, must at the present time inevitably lead not to the exaltation of Platonism, but to the depreciation of Christianity. If we can no longer elevate him to the rank of the heathen apostle whose philosophic insight rivaled the inspired teaching of the first preachers of the Gospel, neither on the other hand shall we be tempted to denounce him, in the language of Petavius, (*Dogm. Theol. De Trinitate*, I, 1, 2), as the source of all the heresies which appeared in the early ages of the Church, nor regard him with some of the Fathers, as the daring Prometheus who stole his heavenly fire from the oracles of God committed to the chosen people. The true glory of Plato is to have approached, by the light of natural reason, nearer than any other ancient philosopher to a knowledge of the being and attributes of God, and of His relation to man, to have been more deeply pervaded than any other with a consciousness of man's dependence upon God and of his duty towards God, to have seen more clearly than any other how the invisible things of God may be understood by the things that are made; and yet to have felt as a religious conviction, if he could not establish as a philosophical conclusion, that the Divine Being, whose attributes are manifested by the creatures,

must yet, in his own nature, transcend that manifestation. Those who desire to go beyond this, and would fain claim for human philosophy an insight with the deeper mysteries of Deity, would do well to bear in mind the wise and sound caution conveyed in the language of the greatest of the scholastic theologians. "Impossibile est per rationem naturalem ad cognitionem Trinitatis Divinarum Personarum pervenire. Ostensum est enim supra quod homo per rationem naturalem in cognitionem Dei pervenire non potest, nisi ex creaturis. Creaturae autem ducunt in Deum cognitionem sicut effectus in causam. Hoc igitur solum ratione naturali de Deo cognosci potest, quod competere ei necesse est secundum quod est omnium rerum principium. Virtus autem creativa Dei est communis toti Trinitati; unde pertinet ad unitatem essentiae, non ad distinctionem personarum. Per rationem igitur naturalem cognosci possunt de Deo ea quae pertinent ad unitatem essentiae, non autem ea quae pertinent ad distinctionem personarum." (Aquinas *Summa*, P. I., Ques. 32, Art. 1).

*Alliance, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE V.

## SCIENTIFIC THEORIES THAT CHALLENGE FAITH

BY PROFESSOR L. S. KEYSER, D.D.

It is a mistake to think that the only subjects of thought that put a strain upon faith are religion and theology. Some persons aver that they cannot accept the doctrines of the Christian system because they are so mysterious. These people declare that they cannot understand God; that He is the inscrutable, unknowable being, if He exists at all. Neither can they conceive how God can be a Trinity; how He could create the universe *ex nihilo*; how He could become incarnate in the person of Jesus Christ; how He could have been "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary"; how He could personally take man's sin and moral task upon Himself, and make propitiation for iniquity; how the soul can endure after the atoms and molecules of the brain have been dissolved.

It shall be the purpose of this paper to show that the scientists of the day also accept certain hypotheses that challenge and stagger faith, and even strain it to the breaking point—to the point, indeed, where it becomes little less than blind credulity. We have, in fact, often been both amused and amazed at men who have protested that they could not believe in the supernatural, and especially in miracles, and then in almost the next breath they would declare their faith in scientific theories that border on the grotesque, that are utterly beyond scientific verification, and that require the most childlike credulousness.

Just for the sake of comparison, let us consider one of the outstanding mysteries of Christian theology—namely, the doctrine of the Trinity, which some people reject because they think it utterly inexplicable. We believe that just as rational a vindication of this doctrine

can be made as of the theory of the atomic or corpuscular composition of matter. This is the process of reasoning.

God is a Trinity—that is, He is both one and three. But remember He is not both one and three in the same respect. There are many things right around us that are one in one respect and three in another respect. So God is one as to His essence or being, but three as to hypostases, persons, and modes of life and functioning.

Mr. Ingersoll used to make great sport of the theologians because, he said, they did not know as much about arithmetic as a small boy in the country school; for the school-boy would say, "One plus one plus one equals *three*"; but the theologians declare that "one plus one plus one equals only *one*!" Then he would smile patronizingly, and his audiences would applaud. Well, suppose we look for a moment at this simple sum in mathematics. Put the formula on the black-board: "One plus one plus one equals three." How many figures have you at the right end of the equation? Why, only one, the figure three. So, after all, in one respect, one plus one plus one equals only one, while of course in another respect it equals three. So with God. But someone says that is only a manipulation of figures. You cannot make good your claim when you take three actual objects and add them together. Let us see. Here are three apples lying on different parts of the table. I want to add them together. So I pick up one and set it down here; then the other and set it down right by the side of the first one; then the third by the side of the second. Now what have I? I have three apples, true enough; but how many *groups* of apples have I? Only one. That collection of apples is one in one respect and three in another. So with the Triune God; one as to essence or being; three as to persons, or *foci* of self-consciousness.

However, no trained theologian has ever contended that God is a mathematical material Trinity. No; God is a psychical or spiritual Trinity. The Bible itself says, "God is a Spirit." Therefore our best illustrations of

this doctrine are not to be found in the material realm, but in the mental or psychical. Have you ever thought about it that in a very inner sense the human mind has a triune constitution. It is made up of the Intellect, the Sensibility and the Will—that is, the cognitive, the emotional and the volitional functioning powers. Yet they do not constitute three minds, but only one mind. More than that, the mind is a unitary entity, and is not made up of parts as a lump of material substance is. Therefore the Intellect is the whole mind, the Sensibility is the whole mind, and the Will is the whole mind; each and all are identically the same substance or quiddity. Each in substance is equal to all, and yet all together are equal to each. Thus we see again that an entity can be, in a very mysterious and profound way, one in one respect and three in another. Remember we do not hold that this is an analogy; it is only an illustration of the point I have stated, that the mind is one in one respect and three in another. So with the Triune God. Only God is *personally* triune, not only *functionally*. This distinction must be made to avoid the old heresy of Modalism, advocated by Sabellius and others in the early days of the Christian Church.

A still profounder illustration of the Trinity may be found in the process of self-consciousness in the human mind. The self, the ego, the mind, can objectify itself—that is, the mind can think of itself, make itself its own objective; it can, as it were, set itself out before itself. There, then, are two, the subject and the object, and both are the same ego and substance. But the circle of self-consciousness is not complete; another step must be taken: there must be another ego set off to one side, as it were, by which the subject cognizes the object as itself, and the object cognizes the subject itself. Now when you have these three acts of the soul, and only then, do you arrive at complete self-consciousness. So with the triune God, who is eternally and perfectly self-conscious, and therefore knows Himself in the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. This is the profoundest illustration of

the Trinity that can be given, because it is an analysis of that deep and inner synthesis which we call self-consciousness; but let us remember that, after all, it is still only an illustration, not an analogue; it designates three modes of life in God, but does not lead us to comprehend how there can be three *foci* of self-consciousness, or three persons, in the one Godhead.

Yet I believe we can press thought still a little further into the wonder and depths of the eternal Trinity by this mode of speculating: If God is the perfect, infinite and absolute Being, we may conceive that, since He must be absolutely perfectly self-conscious, He may exist as three egos, three *foci* of personality, in the same being or substance, each of which knows the others with absolute perspicacity; so that Christ could say, "The Father knoweth the Son, and the Son the Father," and Paul could write by inspiration, "Who knoweth the mind of God save the Spirit of God?"

Thus we can, in a measure, at least, vindicate the profoundest doctrine of religion by a rational process; and we maintain that we can come as near doing this as we can prove many of the theories of physical science, as we shall now proceed to show. There are inscrutable mysteries and insuperable difficulties in the material world as well as in the spiritual sphere. Our Lord said to Nicodemus: "Marvel not that I say unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth," etc. As much as to say, "Do not stumble over the mystery of the new birth. Why, you cannot understand the mystery of the blowing wind. Why should you expect to fathom all the mysteries of the spiritual life? You need not comprehend them; all you have need to do is to experience them, just as you experience action of the wind itself.

Our purpose now will be to consider some of the modern scientific hypotheses, some, too, that the writer himself accepts. We shall show that they carry in their very nature such absolute difficulties as to stretch both faith and reason almost to the breaking point. We shall begin with the Copernican theory of the universe, or at least of



the solar system. Up to the time of this great Prussian investigator, the Ptolemaic view mostly prevailed—the view that all the old astronomers practically held. This view was that the earth is the central orb, and the most important, and that the sun, moon and stars revolve around it. It is called the geocentric view. The theory was wrought out in a wonderful way by means of cycles and epicycles; but of course it was encumbered with insurmountable difficulties. Then came Copernicus, who lived from 1473 to 1543, and who taught that the sun is the greater orb of our system, and that the earth and the other planets swing in vast orbits around it. This is called the heliocentric view, because *helios* means the sun. A century later—1564-1642—lived Galileo, who laid special emphasis on the theory that the earth is round and revolves once in twenty-four hours on its axis. For his advocacy of this view he was persecuted by the Church and condemned and abused by his fellow-scientists; all of which, of course, was very wicked.

I suppose all of us accept Galileo's hypothesis; but think for a moment what a tremendous demand is made on our faith in holding this view. The earth completes a revolution on its axis in twenty-four hours. The earth's circumference at the equator is 25,000 miles. Therefore we who live in the temperate zone must be traveling at the astounding velocity of 700 to a 1000 miles an hour. Have you ever been on an express train that was rushing along at 60 to 70 miles an hour? You well remember what your feelings were. But that is a mere trifle compared with the rate at which you and I are at this moment speeding along on the earth's surface. Here we sit quietly and unconcerned, and to-night we shall go to sleep without a twitch of uneasiness; and yet we are swinging along at nearly a thousand miles an hour, almost 17 miles a minute, almost one-fourth of a mile a second. Now we are here; presto! we are yonder, a mile away. Yet we are not conscious of any movement at all. We seem to be perfectly at rest. This is most astonishing—that we should be rushing along at such an incon-

ceivable speed, and yet are not in the least aware of it. Does not such a theory tug mightily at the strings of faith?

But I have not yet stated the greater part of the difficulty. The atmosphere, so light and volatile, goes with the earth in its impetuous onward rush; so do the clouds and vapors and all the gases of the earth, no matter how light they may be.

But a still more inconceivable thing is that the earth in its mad whirl never *wobbles*; never is deflected a hair's breadth from its strictly spherical revolution on its axis. If so tremendous a sphere were to get out of plumb the diameter of a needle, it would surely fly into chaos, and we—well, deponent sayeth not where we would be. But how can the earth keep from wobbling in its swift rotation? How can it go without the slightest jar? It has no real axis, no spindles projecting out at the north and south poles and resting on something solid. No, it is simply out here in space with apparently nothing but the subliminal ether around it to hold it in place. How does it keep its equilibrium? Why does it not wobble?

When you consider the character of the earth's surface, the difficulty is accentuated. The earth is far from a perfect sphere. It is broken up into oceans and continents, hills, mountains, valleys, plains. The eastern continent is much larger than the western. In both the arctic and antarctic regions there are vast uneven mountains of snow and ice. Note the vast mountain ranges, the Rockies, the Andes, the Alps, the Himalayas, great excrescences on the earth, broken up here and there without any discernible order, with no apparent attempt to preserve the earth's balance on its imaginary axis, and yet the earth goes on gyrating at the rate of a thousand miles an hour, and never veers a hair's breadth from its appointed place. Well may we exclaim with Nicodemus, "How can these things be?"

The writer confesses that sometimes, in thinking over this theory, he grows rebelliously skeptical, and declares, down in his inner consciousness, he does not believe it.

The whole theory of Galileo and Copernicus may be a scientific blunder, a huge mistake, and we may be entirely on the wrong track. There must be some other way of explaining the phenomena of the solar system. But what other hypothesis is there to believe? The earth must be round, or people could not go around it by continuing in the same direction; and if the earth is a globe, it must revolve on its imaginary axis, or there is no way of accounting for the diurnal successions. So there you are—you must believe *volens volens*. It is a case of Hobson's choice.

We have already indicated that we are very swift travelers with the earth in its daily revolution. But the half has not yet been told, if good old Copernicus was right. Would you believe it, we are also voyaging on our planet around the sun? We are being hurled at more than a breakneck speed in the earth's annual journey in its orbit. And here is still a greater challenge to faith, coming again from the scientists, not from the theologians. We are traveling—remember, this is what the astronomers say—at the rate of 66,600 miles an hour with our planet around the sun, or 1,112 miles a minute, or 18 1-2 miles a second. Let us note the demands that science makes on our faith while we are cultivating the fine art of traveling: we are moving this moment in one direction at the rate of nearly 1000 miles an hour, and in another direction at the rate of 66,600 miles an hour. If any one doubts my figures, and thinks I am jesting, I refer him to any modern astronomy, like Todd's manual, and he will find that the astronomers are seriously teaching our boys and girls in the high school and the college these very theories as scientifically established facts. You can figure it for yourself. The earth's elliptical orbit is 584,600,000 miles in circumference; our mundane sphere has to travel all that distance, from perhelion to aphelion and back to perhelion again, in 365 days, 6 hours, 9 minutes and 9 seconds, arriving at every station schedule time. So you can make the division, and find out that you are going leisurely along at the speed of 18 1-2 miles

per second without feeling dizzy or growing excited. Even though hurled at this rate the earth never vacillates the diameter of a hair from its course; and it also carries its atmosphere with it without the loss of an atom, so far as we know. Does not all this seem incredible? Does it not stretch the faith even of a scientist to the breaking tension? I confess that sometimes in my weaker moments I whisper to myself: "There isn't a word of it true. We are utterly on the wrong track." At all events, the man who can bolt this hypothesis ought not to strain at the doctrine of the Trinity or the Incarnation, or balk at the story of the whale that swallowed Jonah. Yes, the Jonah-whale episode is a mere bagatelle compared with the velocity at which you and I and all our fellowmen are traveling with our old mother earth.

Perhaps you will think that all the difficulties have been mentioned; but the physicists join with the astronomers in imposing still another burden on our tottering faith. They tell us about the "ether of space"—that is, a fine, ethereal substance, an almost *thingless* something, that fills all the interspaces among the planets, that bears the light and heat of the sun and other orbs on its lightsome wings, and holds all the planets in their orbits. They say it is thousands of times lighter than the air, is perfectly ductile, mobile and elastic, and yet it is the source of that tremendous power we call gravitation. Now note: the earth, speeding at the rate of 66,600 miles an hour, plunges through this ether; and yet, so light is it, that not enough resistance and friction are met with to retard the globe one second in all the millenniums. What! and that frictionless ether is the force of gravitation that holds Neptune, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Sirius and the Pleiades in their orbits! Does not your faith snap at such a proposition? If it does not, it must be made of tough material.

Next, we shall treat of some scientific hypotheses that do not deal with things on so colossal a scale, but that are no less mysterious. Let us look at matter itself. Some people cannot believe in mind as a distinct quiddity be-

cause, forsooth, they cannot understand what mind is. We are disposed to inquire first what matter is. What is matter anyway? Of what is its substance composed? Or is it really substance? Is it only force? No one has ever seen an ultimate particle of matter any more than he has seen an ultimate element of mind. At the *ultima thule* one is just as mysterious as the other. All we know anything about is the *phenomena* of both mind and matter; we do not know the *noumena*—the things in themselves, just as the philosophers have said for centuries. Here is an old saw we used to hear in our boyhood days: Some would ask you, "What is mind?" you would answer, "No matter." Then he would ask you, "What is matter?" and you would reply, "Never mind." But that is no explanation; it is only a quip, an evasion.

Some people are greatly puzzled about the infinite. They cannot understand at all what the infinite is. However, they never seem to reflect that the infinitesimal is just as mysterious. Take matter, and say, as many scientists do, that it is composed of atoms. If you ask them, What is an atom? they reply, It is a particle of matter that is so small and so constituted that it cannot be made any smaller. But how can that be? Can you conceive of a particle of matter that could not be halved or quartered? Then why cannot these diminutive particles be subdivided; and so on and on, *ad infinitum*. You can think, but you cannot think the problem through. At last you must simply give it up. Yes, the infinitely tiny is just as baffling to thought as is the infinitely immense. Yet the physicists and chemists insist that we must believe in atoms or atomies, or at least in something ultimate.

Suppose, now, we take a still deeper look at the modern theory of matter. But to go back: Democritus, the Greek philosopher, is usually called the father of the atomic theory of matter. He made some advance in refinement over his predecessors, whom we cannot take time to mention. But when some one asked Democritus how the atoms held together, he said they had *hooks*.

But that simply throws the mystery back a little further, for the next question would be, What are the *hooks* made of? Epicurus and Lucretius, the former in prose, the latter in poetry, developed the doctrines of Democritus, and the three together were the founders of the materialistic theories that have come down through the centuries and are in the world to-day.

The modern theories, however, hark back a good deal further into the constitution of matter than did their predecessors of the olden times. Atoms no longer are satisfactory. They are too big and ponderous, too coarse and lumbering, and in themselves explain little, while they themselves must be explained. Of course, the Greeks knew nothing scientifically of electricity and magnetism, nor of radium, helium, uranium, thorium, actinium, etc. So to-day the scientist must get back to something a great deal finer and more pliant than atoms. Therefore they presuppose the universal ether, the substance that fills all space not occupied by suns, stars, planets and comets, and that is the substratum and source of all the ponderable and palpable matter of the universe. This ether is the primordial material. Sometimes it is called "the eternal receiver and transmitter of force." Note the attributes assigned by science to this marvellous substance. It is most highly refined and sublimated, perfectly ductile, mobile, continuous and elastic, not made up of atoms or particles of any kind.

Here is a breaking test of faith again. How can a substance exist without having parts and being composed of atoms? How can anything material have perfect continuity? How can such attenuated substance be so elastic and strong that it can be indefinitely stretched by the flying stars and planets without breaking? These are hypotheses that seem to be utterly untenable. Nor is this all. The ether is, after all, slightly inert, say the physicists, because it offers enough resistance to the light waves to retard them eight minutes in traversing the distance from the sun to the earth, which is 93,000,000 miles. But if it has enough weight and inertia to retard the

waves of light, how can the earth, with its vast bulk slip through it at the rate of 1,100 miles a minute without friction? This theory stretches one's faith about as much as the racing planets stretch the ether! Surely if the ether has the least resistance and inertia, it would scale off our mundane atmosphere, and perhaps convert the earth itself into an incandescent ball by the friction caused by its velocity.

The scientists assume the existence of the primordial ether. They do not presume to tell how it came into existence. If it just happens to be, that is again a breaking pull on our faith. However, assuming the ether to be a real entity, its original condition was that of pure homogeneity and quiescence. If that is so, how could it ever get into motion and convert itself into heterogeneity? Can you get diversity out of pure sameness without an outside force? If so, how? Can absolute quiescence ever bring about motion with no external help? How did motion ever begin? There can be no motion without force, but where did the force come from? Of course, it may have just happened to come along at the fortuitous moment, but some of us who are troubled with skepticism, cannot help wondering how it could just happen to come along, and if it did just happen, how it could have produced such a wonderful cosmos of order and law as the present universe is.

Well, to continue the story: In some way, no one knows how, and at some place, no one knows where, the ether was thrown into vortices—that is, infinitely small whorls or whirlpools; these eddies formed ions, which were charged with electricity both negative and positive, thus making electrons; and these coming together in just the fortuitous way, formed atoms; the various atoms, being combined in divers ways, formed molecules, which in turn combined into all the various known palpable substances. There you have it in a nutshell—the program of the production of the material universe.

However, here again a sore strain is imposed on our faith. Of course, we can see how God, if He created the



pristine ether, could very easily have set it here and there into whorls, and thus given it motion. But what we cannot understand is how these vortices in a continuous and atomless ether could have formed the particles of matter called ions. We repeat, if there were absolutely no particles there in the original ether, we do not comprehend how *whirlpools* could have produced *particles*. If you were to set a number of eddies to going in water, you would rather spread the water out further and further than cause it to come together into solid lumps. If the scientists will let God come into the process at all, we would think He would not have produced ponderable material from the ether by means of whorls, but would rather have pressed the ether here and there into solid particles, then made electricity and charged the ions with it, thus forming electrons, which He combined into atoms and molecules. But without supernatural power back of and in the process, we certainly cannot see that the assigned causes are adequate to produce the assigned effects.

Physical science multiplies difficulties in its many assumptions and theories. It has pushed the mystery back from the atom to the ion, which it now hails as the smallest particle of matter, the nucleus of the atom. Some hold the atom to be a "closed" system with its electricised ions whirling about within it. There are both negative and positive ions. The negative ions are the more important, and are called corpuscles. We quote here from Dr. R. W. Micou, who has given special study to the new theory of matter. He says of the infinitesimal corpuscles: "They are all alike in nature and size, and constitute actual parts of the forms of matter from which they fly. Their velocity is between 10,000 and 90,000 miles a second, or about half the velocity of light. They are almost inconceivably small, being about one-thousand part of a hydrogen atom, which has heretofore been considered the smallest particle of matter." At another place this author says that the beta corpuscles produced by radio-activity "move with very nearly the velocity of

light"—that is, they fly off at the marvellous speed of 186,000 miles a second. Let us bear in mind that even an atom is a microscopic particle of matter. No one has ever seen an atom or a molecule, not even with the most powerful microscope. The scientist, Kauffman, a recognized authority, tells us that an electron is to a bacillus as a bacillus is to the earth. There are millions of atoms in a drop of water, and it takes a thousand ions to make the smallest atom known, that of hydrogen. Yet the ion is flying at the rate of 186,000 miles a second! There! in that second an ion has traveled 186,000—if there was nothing to obstruct its progress! This is one of the serious contentions of science. When we read of such speculations, we wonder whether the scientific guild are aware of the terrible burden they are imposing on a layman's faith. We do not mean to say we reject the scientist's guess, or that we have a better theory to propound, for we have not; but we confess that it is easier for us to believe that God caused the sun and moon to stand still over Ajalon in answer to Joshua's prayer than it is to believe in the amazing exploits and athletic feats of those infinitesimal ions of the scientists. We are not making fun; we are very much in earnest; and therefore we must confess frankly that there is no doctrine of theology that so strains our faith as the gymnastics of the ions and electrons.

The scientists tell us that no particles of matter are at rest; all are dancing and whirling in even the most solid substances. They tell us that heat is only a mode of motion; that the reason an object feels hot is not because there is any real heat there, but because the waves of ether have pushed the atoms farther apart, and given them a swifter motion and a wider orbit; and thus, when you touch a so-called heated substance, these tiny dancing dervishes strike your hand with enough force to raise a blister! Of course, in some mysterious way—not explained by science, as far as we know—the increased rapidity of the motion of the atoms turns the heated stone red, so that we call it "red hot." We do not for a moment

mean to say that we reject these theories; yet we confess that at the bar of reason they seem to be sadly inadequate, and really create more difficulties than they explain.

The science of the day appears to have accepted without demur the undulatory theory of light. Perhaps it is the true view. At all events, we have no better one to advance. However, we must say that sometimes we grow rebelliously agnostical. Let us examine the modern scientific theory of optics, and see how many difficulties it imposes on both our faith and our reason. First, according to this view, there is no luminous ether or substance, but light is simply and solely the result of the wave-like movements in the universal ether. Even the sun is not in itself luminous; but for some cause its atoms and molecules have been set into such violent motion, and their orbits extended so greatly, that this very rapidity of motion, in some way, produces light; or in reality not light in the sun itself, which is as dark as Erebus, but the accelerated motion of its atoms sets the ether into undulations, which spread out through space like waves of the sea, until finally some of them strike the eye of a human being or an animal, and then, in some mysterious way not explained, they are converted into luminosity through the optic nerve in the brain and the consciousness.

Now, anent this seemingly beautiful theory, we want to raise this fundamental question: If the ether is entirely dark, and if the human eye, with its iris, crystalline lens, aqueous and vitreous humors, its retina and optic nerve, is also dark, how can the black waves of the ether falling on the black organs of the eye be converted into the sensation of light *merely by motion*? Will anybody arise and explain how these things can be? How can nature get light out of darkness without a luminous ether? Sometimes as we ponder these matters, we almost feel like declaring that the undulatory theory of light is all wrong, and that the old theory, that light is really a luminous ether, is the true one; so that, when it penetrates the eye, the sensation of luminousness is easily produced.

Nor is the mystery of light and color lessened when we

are told that the different colors of the spectrum are due to the variation in the length of the ethereal waves; that ultra-red is produced by the longest waves, and ultra-violet by the shortest waves. What is there, we would humbly ask, about a long wave of a dark substance that it should produce a dark-red sensation, and about a short wave that it should produce extreme violet? If some one should explain that the sensation of light is due to the action of electricity in the ether when its waves strike the visual organs, we would reply, "Then you have introduced another ether besides the universal ether to help you out of your difficulty, and that only increases the mystery as to how the earth in its revolution and its course about the sun can slip through *two* ethers without creating friction!" Besides, most scientists tell us that electricity is itself only a mode of motion, or at least the result of motion, and so we come back to our first inquiry, how the wavelets can convert a dark substance into light. The conversion of a sinner into a saint is no more mysterious than that.

And now, in the language of Holy Writ, "Behold, I show you a mystery." The various colors depend on the rapidity of the ether vibrations. And what, according to science, is that rapidity? I quote from a recent work of science, used in high schools and colleges, Hinman's "Eclectic Physical Geography": "When the rate of vibration is 392 trillions a second, the sensation of *red* is produced upon the eye. As the vibrations increase in rapidity, they give rise successively to each of the color sensations of the spectrum. If the rapidity of vibration increases beyond that which produces the sensation of violet (757 trillions to the second), the eye is not affected, and they cease to be luminous. A ray of sunlight is composed of vibrations of all degrees of rapidity, which collectively produce a white or colorless sensation."

There you have the theory all as clear as midday! For convenience we will strike an average between 392 trillions, and 757 trillions, which is about 574 trillions. Now, in order to produce in the eye the sensation of white light,

the ether pulsations must strike the retina and optic nerve at the rate of 574 trillions per second!! I have placed two exclamation points after that statement. What becomes of the miracles of the fish swallowing the run-away prophet in comparison with this optical miracle propounded to us in all seriousness by modern science? Just ponder the supreme miracle for a moment. The ether pounds on your eye 574 trillions of times a second in producing light, and yet you are not aware of any motion or impact whatever, but have, on the other hand, a sensation of perfect immobility. "How can these things be? How can a man be born when he is old?" Note the difficulty and the contradiction of science. It holds that the ether is slightly inert—that is, has a slight degree of weight, else it would not require eight minutes for light to travel from the sun to the earth. We maintain that, if the ether has any degree of weight, even the slightest, 574 trillions of vibrations a second beating upon the eye would pound that delicate organ to pieces. But the scientists do not think so. They have a stalwart and boundless faith. Nothing staggers it—at least, no wonder in the physical realm. It is only when men like Haeckel, Tyndal, Huxley, Ward and Mains come to consider such Biblical mysteries as the miraculous conception of Christ that they balk, and their faith cannot or will not bear the strain!

We propound still another enigma in the modern scientific theory of optics. It relates to the very common function of physical sight. How do we see? The present theory is that yonder tree, green and symmetrical, throws back the waves of the ether with inconceivable velocity upon my eyes. They penetrate the iris, dash through the lenses and humors, form an inverted image of the tree on the retina, and then, in some mysterious way, the optic nerve bears that image back into the proper brain center, where, in a still more mysterious way, it blossoms out into my consciousness, and, behold, I see a tree out there on the lawn. A beautiful hypothesis, in very truth, and I confess that I myself believe it. But how mysterious! how inexplicable! Observe the

*lacunae*, the dark places, in the process. How and why does the tree set the ether in motion? How can the transverse oscillations of the ether bear to the eye the image of the tree? What is the precise connection between the ethereal undulations and the color, shape and size of the object? If the mind, through the optic nerve, simply perceives the image of the tree on the retina of the eye, how comes it that I see the tree out yonder on the lawn and not within my eye at all? Centuries before modern science knew that the eye had a moving-picture curtain on its rear wall, men had been seeing objects just where they were out there in space, and had not the slightest suspicion that they were merely perceiving pictures on optical screens. Thus we see that our consciousness and our scientific theory do not agree; and that is another strange mystery. Why should we be so constructed that we think we see objects when we really see only images?

In order to prove that my perception and awareness are correct, whether the scientific hypothesis is or not, I simply walk out to the spot where I think I see the tree, and, behold, I find it *there*, and not in my eye. How inscrutable! How past finding out!

Thus we might continue to point out dark, inexplicable riddles in the theories of modern science. There is the hypothesis of gravitation—is it a push or a pull? Is it some kind of an attractive power that matter possesses toward its fellow-matter all through the universe? If so, how can one body draw another through the space between the planets without any ropes with which to pull—without any strong and unbreakable substance that will endure the strain? Or is gravitation due to the universal ether, as the most recent pronouncements of science would have us believe? Then how can that light, ductile, subliminal substance, which permits the earth to slip through it at the rate of 66,600 miles an hour without friction and retardation, be so strong as to hold the planets and suns in their orbits? It is all very, very mys-

terious. The doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation are not more so.

Note a whole catalogue of scientific riddles of the universe: the theory of evolution without an Involver or Evolver; the theory of the fortuitous concourse of vortices and atoms producing an orderly cosmos and "the reign of law;" the theory of an unconscious intelligence and will operating in all things; the conception of a "power that makes for righteousness," and that still is impersonal; the view of design and adaptation without a conscious, designing intelligence; the proposition that the atoms are endowed with mentality, and when enough of these infinitesimal minds come together in a conference-meeting in the human brain, presto! they produce the human mind; the hypothesis that human sentiency, consciousness, morality and spirituality have evolved by purely resident forces from material substance, making the effect greater and nobler than its producing cause; the theory of parallelism in psychology; the theory of pluralism and pragmatism in philosophy, ethics and theology; and so on and so forth. But we must forbear.

Our purpose in presenting this thesis has not been mere art for art's sake. We frankly concede that our primary motive has been a moral one. Our aim has been to show that, in science as well as in religion, we must often walk by faith and not by sight; that we cannot always find our way by pure reason or purely logical processes; that the science of the day makes as strenuous a demand on our behalf as do the doctrines of theology and religion; that theology and religion have no monopoly on the mysterious; that general skepticism never gets anywhere nor achieves any success, but that faith is necessary for constructive work and advancement in any realm of the worth while. How many things in this life we must take by faith! Yes, "faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Call the roll of the heroes of faith; they have all been men who have achieved success and have pushed along the car of progress. The inspired writer looked into the very heart



of things when he penned the line, "Without faith it is impossible to please God."

Our theme teaches us another needed moral and spiritual lesson—that of humility. How little we know? How little can we know? The sum of human erudition sometimes seems to be large; yet the more we advance and discover, the more we realize the limits of human knowledge. Therefore we may well heed the admonition of Holy Writ, "Be not wise in your own conceits."

*Hamma Divinity School,  
Springfield, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE VI.

## THE THEOLOGY OF JOSEPH FORT NEWTON.

BY PAUL HAROLD HEISEY, B.D., MA.

"From Western Prairie to London Pulpit." In these words a leading conservative religious journal announces the removal of the Rev. Joseph Fort Newton, Litt.D., from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, where he has served as pastor of the Liberal Christian Church, to London to become pastor of the City Temple, whose pulpit was recently vacated through the resignation of Reginald J. Campbell. The incident has been suggested to smack of the romantic. One of the elements in the romance was the weekly publication in a daily newspaper, owned and published by a Lutheran layman, of the Sunday morning sermons of Dr. Newton. These found their way into the hands of the editor of the *London Christian Commonwealth*. Upon the resignation of Reginald Campbell an ambassador was sent from London to Cedar Rapids to interview Dr. Newton as a possible candidate for the pulpit. After correspondence, a visit to London by Dr. Newton, and an exchange of terms and conditions we find Dr. Newton ministering to the City Temple congregation.

Joseph Fort Newton was born in Decatur, Texas, July 21, 1876. He was educated at the Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Ky., and was ordained to the Baptist ministry in 1893. He served as pastor of the First Baptist Church, Paris, Texas, 1897-1898; Non-sectarian Church, St. Louis, 1898-1900; he founded and served the People's Church, Dixon, Ill., 1901-1908; the Liberal Christian Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1908-1917. He is the author of the following works: *David Swing, Poet-Preacher*; *Abraham Lincoln*; *Lincoln and Herndon*; *The Eternal Christ*; *Sermons and Lectures*; *The Builders*; *Wesley and Woolman*; and *What Have the Saints to Teach Us?*

What of the man and his message? Some condemn him utterly; others are willing to admit that he is helpful in many ways, but in the main dangerous to evangelical Christianity; still others look upon him as an "angel of light."

He tells that his mother left a deep impress upon his life and to her he owes much. He dedicates his volume, "The Eternal Christ," to "My Mother, Sue Green Newton, a sweet Christian Mystic, who first taught me of the Eternal Christ." Some one quotes him as saying that his life divides into two parts upon the experience of reading the works of Emerson. The sermons of Robertson, and the preaching of Dr. George A. Gordon, Boston, also played a great part in the determination of his religious experience and his theological views.

He gives us the following analysis of his own make-up: "Blessed or cursed with an intellect critical, analytical, of ultra-conservative cast and habit of thought, tinged by a temperament which if it had its way, would make this world dismal and dun-colored—it is surely significant that a mind so made up finds itself, mid-way in this mortal life, a devoted lover of Christ and an humble student of the great mystics."

Philosophically he is out-spoken against monism and is frankly dualistic. Somewhat pantheistic in his tendencies, one might call him an "immanent idealist." He is not coldly logical or philosophical in his preaching but rather warmly inspirational.

He is guided in his thinking and preaching by what might be termed "the authority of the spirit," rather than by any objective standard. His whole nature, thought-life, and preaching is saturated with the mystical. He criticises our age for its lack of the cultivation of the inner life. He teaches suggestively rather than dogmatically; his preaching is topical rather than textual.

The sources of his thought are many. He is at home in philosophy, and literature. He makes very little use of scientific references or illustrations in his sermons but draws heavily upon the poets and the mystics. A

cursory review of a large collection of sermons reveals references to the following: Plato, Ovid, Socrates, Tertullian, Augustine, Dante, a Kempis, Luther, Kant, Bunyan, Wesley, Spencer, Shakespeare, Browning, Carlyle, Ruskin, Newman, Romanes, Huxley, Lange, Gladstone, J. S. Mill, Emerson, Lincoln, Arnold, Swing, Höffding, Kidd, Tolstoi, Robertson, Bushnell, Kipling, Eucken, H. G. Wells, Nietzsche, Royce, Bergson, etc.

Religion for Dr. Newton, is to live with God and to do His work. He speaks of Micah 6:9, "Do justly, love mercy and walk humbly," as describing "the religion of all good men." Religion is an organizing principle among the values of life. Religions are many but religion is one. It is the tie that unites us to God, and man to man. He describes religion as the life of the spirit; and it is this life of the spirit that is the inspiration of human progress. Religion "is the increasing purpose running through the ages, revealing itself in the experiences, the inventions, the discoveries, and the institutions of man." Religion "does not consist in a few acts such as prayer, worship, solemn rite and ritual, word, but in the spirit in which we do things." "Men are discovering that religion is not a hierocratic mystery nor a social convention, but a power by means of which to live the day through more deeply, more bravely, more fruitfully." "Religion is no longer a thing apart from life, it is life itself at its highest and best." These thoughts culled from the sermons of Dr. Newton indicate in a general way his viewpoint of religion.

Coming now to some of the more specific doctrines of religion, we will turn our attention first to the doctrine of God as held by Dr. Newton. He bitterly opposes any suggestion of agnosticism, for to hold that man cannot know God involves the thought that God cannot make Himself known to man. "We do not know all about God, but we know something about Him." "Of necessity our deepest knowledge of God comes through what is most Godlike in us, as ever the mystics taught." The moral sense is God within us. The impulse to love, to pity, to

serve, to give ourselves to others is the spirit of God moving to and fro in our hearts. In admitting that God is not fully known by us Dr. Newton appeals to the Bible as showing that it teaches that God is only partially known by His children. Pre-eminently, we know God through the life and teachings of Jesus.

Dr. Newton's specific interpretation of God inclines strongly to the immanence of God. "God is not only outside his world, but within." "God is also in the world and in ourselves, a universal spirit unfolding itself in history." There is deep kinship between the human and the divine.

Our knowledge of God remains an individual experience, and here Dr. Newton's mysticism reaches its summit. "It is therefore that the mystic knows not by vague rumor or confused report, but by the fact that he passes from the outer court into the inner sanctuary where the sweet voice sounds and the vision dwells." While acknowledging the place of reason in religion and human thought he maintains that reason is insufficient. "What is truly religious is ultimately reasonable, but reason alone is not enough."

Man, for Dr. Newton, is both the interpreter and the interpretation of nature. Dr. Newton deals very little with the scientific questions of the origin and nature of man, although he suggests "we have descended and ascended."

Of the fall of man he says little, and yet he uses such a phrase as "the forgiveness of sins." Sin is very largely a matter of lack of harmnoy with God. It is the individual's separation from God.

The Bible as a unique revelation, miraculously given to man, is not handled by Dr. Newton in his preaching. His sermons are prefaced with texts from the Bible. It is to him divine literature, "the Book of books," never criticised, always respected and revered, but never defended from a dogmatic attitude. That it is a divinely inspired book he would not deny, but as to venturing a complete defense or explanation of it upon any of the com-

monly accepted theories of inspiration or of its production he does not enter. He uses the Bible for the purpose of inspiration for his own thinking, preaching, and living.

A brief reference to miracles shows Dr. Newton's interpretation to be, that miracles are the operation of the "higher laws of God."

In his sermon on "The Faith," Dr. Newton holds "the faith" to be more than a system of theology, more than an institution, not a philosophy but a fellowship, a mystical union with Christ. For him, "keeping the faith" would mean loyalty to the high vows of the soul, to the moral being of God, to the highest in humanity, and to the heavenly vision.

With such a broad and liberal interpretation of "the faith" one would expect him to belittle theology and talk much of "reconstruction." But such is not the case. This is due first of all to an inherent respect for the workers in the field of human thought, especially in the field of theology, and also to a lack of interest in all statements of doctrine because time will necessitate constant change, and any present reconstruction will be subject to future changes. He frankly states his attitude in these words: "The great minds who have toiled to build a House of Doctrine deserve the homage of mankind. They thought deeply of divine things. They sought to form the minds of men in worthy ideas, to cast over our fleeting life the dignity and power of a consistent thought of the universe. They dreaded the chaos that comes of living by the light of our vagrant insights, as they feared the superstition into which religion sinks without the criticism and discipline of the intellect. No doubt their forms of thoughts are now archaic, as ours will be in times to come, but they were noble servants of the race. They erred, manifestly, in trying to fashion a final form of faith. The final faith, if it appears while history is still rolling on, must be compatible with vast and unpredictable changes of thought. It must be able to live in new times as they unfold, with new developments of life. As such it can-

not be a system of dogma, but a life, a great perception, a consensus of insight, aspiration, and experience."

The discussion of his view of creeds and "the faith" leads naturally to his view of the Church as an institution. He maintains that Jesus did not use the term "Church" in the sense that we do. The Church for Dr. Newton is a spiritual fellowship. It is made up of those who love Christ and live the life of service. He is not antagonistic to denominations, any more than to creeds, seeing their historic origin and explaining them in the light of history. However, he is more interested in the invisible Church. He maintains that the Church has always been one, at least in spirit. The business of the Church is to testify; for the true apologetic is not argument but testimony. His view of the Church as an institution is brought out in the following test of membership in his own local church before leaving for City Temple, London: "Asking no man to make profession of a faith already attained, but rather, to become comrades with us in the quest and service of One who is the Saviour, teacher, comforter, burden-bearer, and friend of all."

Salvation, to Dr. Newton, means the life of fellowship with God through Christ, a fellowship for the present and for eternity. It is the experience of harmony with God. "What is meant by saving the soul of man? . . . If it means that any soul is ever lost to God, then there is no such thing." "It is a common salvation open to all, inviting all; destined at last to woo all into its eternal harmony."

Christ, the center of Christianity, also appears to be the center and heart of the preaching of Dr. Newton. Many sermons deal directly with Christ and problems or ideals associated with Him, and all sermons revolve about and culminate in Him. And yet there is much that puzzles one in discovering Dr. Newton's exact position as to the Christ. He writes: "What we call Christ has been in the world from the beginning." This would lead us to believe that he rejects anything in the way of a historical Christ, but not so. "What men sought was made flesh in



Galilee." "So great is the reality of Christ that no man can know His fulness, but only that segment of it that is nearest to his own life." He maintains that our interpretation of Christ depends upon our experience of Christ. In his sermons, Dr. Newton frequently regrets the strife that has been occasioned by men's interpretations of Christ. Thus, he does not condemn another man's interpretation but equally claims the right to make his own interpretation. Dr. Newton does not attempt to make a complete explanation of the Christ. He dwells upon the impossibility of such an explanation. He rejoices in the prologue of John, estimating it as the "profoundest philosophy on earth." Again, his mystical strain enters into his explanation of the Christ, in that he maintains that He should not be presented through argument but sought through "vision."

"Christ," writes Dr. Newton, "is not an exotic, not an alien force coming from without, but the flower of a long process of evolution, revealing, in His fragrance and fruit, the spirit and the meaning of the whole." In one sermon, Dr. Newton centers his views of Christ about three propositions: (1) Christ is a real fact of history. His divinity shines through his humanity. (2) He is more than a person, he is a "personality." He is a force from the unseen. (3) He is a growing power in history. He is the great spiritual dynamic of history. Christ is fact, force and friend. He is the divine life; the divine reality; the perfect man; the truest teacher the race has known; the mighty way-shower; He is more than "the best we know"; He is the final fact of nature; the central figure of history; the hope of the future of the race; He is the Redeemer of humanity; His victory is sure. These titles and statements culled from the sermons of Dr. Newton open up to us his view of the Christ. Of the ontological problem of the person of Christ he says little or nothing, of the experience of Christ in life, and his ethical sonship of the Father he says much. Of the work of the Christ *per se* he writes little although he refers to

the atonement; which, if he explains at all, it is on the moral side and omits all reference to its judicial aspect.

Immortality is one of his favorite themes. He uses it for his Easter message and frequently at other times. He refers to the ancient, and universal, and instinctive hope of immortality. He points out the favorable attitude of modern science towards this hope. A new era came into Christian life, and life in general, through the Easter fact. "It is that Jesus made Himself known to His friends after His death on the cross, convincing their misgivings, overcoming their fears, dispelling their doubts." Immortality is an experience to be known in this life.

The published sermons of Dr. Newton are always prefaced with a prayer. He addresses Deity affectionately as "Our Father," and makes his petitions "In His Name." Our treatment of his theology would indicate the substance of his prayers. In his sermons he speaks of the "efficacy of prayer."

If we have read Dr. Newton aright, and have given above the substance of his theology, one notices the absence of many of the themes dealt with in the average pulpit, among which are such topics as sin *per se*, the incarnation, the virgin birth, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the Holy Spirit as a person, and the sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Naturally, the war has projected a new element into his preaching, and especially since he is an American filling one of London's great pulpits. He discussed the war in a sermon entitled, "The Sword of America," preached in the City Temple, London, Nov. 1st, 1917. His text was, "My sword shall be bathed in heaven," Isaiah XXXIV, 5. Among other things he said: "There are those who think that the use of any kind of force is wrong if it be used in behalf of moral and spiritual ends. Not at all. Force used righteously in behalf of righteousness is a sword of the Lord."

"So, at least, Americans think of it, and with a few winsome and ardent exceptions, they are quite unanimous

in feeling that the cause in behalf of which America and her allies fight is the cause of simple justice, decency, and mercy upon earth."

Discussing the matter of "conscientious objectors" he says: "But for the man who will not render any service to his country because it is at war, and he perchance may be lending some countenance to the existence of war, Americans can have little respect. Conscience, then sinks to the level of mere crankery. Such a person is not the object of scorn but of pity. To such conscientious objections, then, America objects on conscientious grounds. . . . Let us be as true to Christianity as our sinful nature will allow us, and the grace of God will help us to be, but let us not identify Christianity with moral insanity."

He interprets for the English people the American attitude on the war in these words: "My sword shall be bathed in heaven,' in heavenly principles, in a heavenly spirit. So far as we in America are concerned, it is not a war of hate. It is not a war of revenge; we have no old scores to clear off. It is not a war of conquest, we do not want an inch of land from any people. But we realize that Europe cannot be free, America cannot be free, that no free institution can be safe, until the military autocracy of Prussia is crushed, and to that one end we unite with you, heart and hand and soul, that the future may be safer and nobler for your children and for ours."

From the standpoint of conservative orthodoxy criticism could be brought against almost all, if not all, the theological tenets of Dr. Newton. It is true that he uses many of the accepted terms of orthodoxy but usually with new meanings; and on the other hand he may be expressing old truths in new ways. We shall not attempt such a detailed criticism as might be brought from the standpoint of the commonly accepted interpretation of Christianity. In a general way, the criticism might be brought against Dr. Newton that he does not seem to have a well-defined system of theology. He probably does not seek for such. Modern thought seems to decry a closed system in any field of thought, and no longer asks a philoso-

pher for a complete system but rather for a contribution to human thought. Dr. Newton's lack of a system of theology follows naturally from his deep mysticism, and his preaching is open to the criticism that the work of all mystics is open to, that of a haziness which lacks in concreteness and is devoid of specific teachings. There follows from this general attitude a certain lack of logic in his preaching, which, while not extremely destructive to the results he seeks, is at least somewhat confusing.

His whole tendency is that of religious individualism, which also follows naturally from mysticism in experience and teaching. What might satisfy his soul, and also another individual, may not offer the solution for the religious problems of the race. Individualism, if logically carried out in any field of thought or experience, would lead to anarchy. Individualism, again, while not necessarily anti-social usually results in an unsocial attitude towards life. Thus, mysticism and religious individualism frequently fail to associate religion with the social and moral problems of community life, and with the religious duties of the individual as they pertain to the Kingdom of God as an objective reality to be experienced in human affairs.

The question arises, Is Dr. Newton Unitarian, Universalist, Trinitarian, or what? Dr. Newton's former church, the Liberal Christian Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, is usually classified as Universalist. Dr. Newton is probably not totally acceptable to either Unitarians or Trinitarians. I have heard his "Eternal Christ" severely criticised by a Unitarian minister, and I have heard his views frequently assailed by Trinitarians. He frequently attends the conferences of the Unitarians and the Universalists. On the other hand, he fellowshipped, at their own request, with the Ministers' Association of Cedar Rapids, composed of ministers of the evangelical denominations, and was frequently in other evangelical gatherings and groups.

When asked, "What to you is the most significant, most needed teaching of the Bible in our day?" he replied,

"Christ! The great phrase of Paul, "In Christ"—with the added promise and consummation, "the hope of glory" for man."

In appreciation of Dr. Newton it can be said that he has rendered a great service in making religion real to a host of men and women who have ignored less liberal preachers and religious workers. His sympathetic appeal, his deep religious nature, and his catholic presentation of the Christ (to be experienced rather than to be explained) has appealed to many who have rallied to him to an unusual degree of devotion, loyalty, and admiration. One of the elements that makes his appeal so attractive has been the literary polish and finish of his written and spoken discourses, but this alone would not have accomplished the results. Back of the literary finish is a soul which has wrought much, and which with a confident sincerity presents its message fearlessly.

Unlike many liberals Dr. Newton has been positive rather than negative. This again has strengthened his appeal. With sympathy for all views and tender regard for the experience of every man, Dr. Newton has presented his message in a positive manner; not critical of others; patient with every sincere seeker of the truth. Dr. Newton is not only positive, rather than negative, but is at all times optimistic, hopeful of mankind. Again, his appeal has been dependent, no doubt, upon the fact that he has preached a religion of experience rather than metaphysical explanations of religious facts. While sympathetic and liberal he has at the same time maintained an attitude of independence. There are some things which he positively rejects and fearlessly denounces, though conceding to others the same privilege to condemn his views. In all he maintains a reverent attitude towards God and a sympathetic attitude towards man; and is deeply religious in all relations of life. In the messages of Dr. Newton, both the conservative and the liberal in theology will find much to stimulate thought, and above all to inspire one's soul.

Naming conditions which he did not think would be ac-

cepted by the congregation of City Temple, London, when they sent their call to him, he now finds himself standing in one of the most influential pulpits of the world. He conceives his practical work to be "to organize it from a great crowd into a great church. It has been a great preaching station, but this is too heavy a load for any one to carry. It should be an organic community, all sharing the load of spiritual uplift."

His higher mission he conceives thus: "My solitary aim, my sacramental ambition, is to make the living, eternal Christ real and vivid to men, so that they may find in the fellowship of God in Christ, light, leading, healing."

*North Liberty, Iowa.*

## ARTICLE VII.

## THE CENTENARY OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.

BY W. H. DUNBAR, D.D.

At the last meeting of the General Synod, the retiring President said: "In view of the approach of the Hundredth Anniversary of the General Synod, I suggest the appointment of a committee of five to make plans for its worthy celebration."

No time for such celebration was fixed, but the action was passed with a unanimous vote and the committee was appointed. The report with its suggestion was passed without a word of dissent, and it indicates the universal desire to honor the Hundredth Anniversary of the General Synod.

It was the privilege of the General Synod at that convention in Unity Church, Chicago, to take action, hastening the consummation of a merger of the Lutherans of three bodies. In view of this action the General Synod will soon terminate its separate existence, and merge its life with that of other bodies.

Among the General Synod men who hail this proposed union as of God, there are not a few whose memories reach far back in the history of the General Synod, and to whom it was an object of life-long loyalty and devotion, and who have striven for it, and have sacrificed for it.

No time was set for the celebration of this anniversary; it would naturally come in 1926, but it may be fixed at an earlier date. In the meantime it is fitting that we pause to estimate the contribution that the men of the General Synod have made to American Lutheran History. Rev. Dr. C. M. Jacobs has made such an estimate of the work of the fifty years by the men of the General Council. We have read this with interest. Among the names he mentions are those whom we have honored. But we have a profound sense of appreciation for the men of the General



Synod and sincerely respect the work they have done for American Lutheran History.

I. *Doctrinal Basis.* From the very beginning of its life the General Synod has stood for a clearly defined and unequivocal endorsement of the Lutheran Confession. On this the men of the early General Synod at Gettysburg worked for years. Dr. S. S. Schmucker gave the best of his talents to the clear exposition of Lutheran doctrine. It is true that he went temporarily astray in his "Definite Platform," but this was only a passing phenomenon and was soon swept aside. Dr. James A. Brown, clear-headed and loyal as a teacher of the faith, came after him with a clear and strong statement of the doctrines of the Church. When the Theological Seminary of the General Synod was founded at Gettysburg in 1826, it was required that "the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures should be taught there, as contained in the Augsburg Confession." This was one of the signs of the desire to buttress the Church against the power of rationalism by restoring its theology to historical foundations.

II. *Unique Form of Organization.* Dr. Jacobs claims for the Council a unique form of organization. "The founders aimed to make it a continental body. They wished it to be the meeting place of all confessional Lutherans. They desired to see within it all the Lutheran bodies of whatever national or racial origin, which were willing to subscribe to the fundamental principles." This it is true was its aim, and for this it worked through all its history. But the General Synod stood for all the forces of the Church. And it succeeded in welding together all the various enterprises of the Church, and comes to the close of its centenary with the result of its united efforts, to lay it down as its offering to the United Lutheran Church of America.

III. *The Preservation of Historical Forms of Worship.* The General Synod has had its conflicts in the use of Liturgies. But it has slowly but surely come to the historic forms of worship of the Lutheran Church in common with the other bodies of the "United Lutheran

Church." Its men have entered very heartily into the work of preparing "The Common Service," which is the outward sign of the inner unity into which they have grown.

IV. *The Great Leaders of the General Synod.* There are names which come to us as we recall the days of 1867. They are the names of men who stood loyally to that for which the General Synod stood—M. Valentine, gentle, sweet-spirited,—W. M. Baum, a prince as a legislator, a guide to the great trust,—Luther Albert, faithful and true always,—A. C. Wedekind, strong, stalwart in faith and practice,—Edwin Hutter, for years a pastor in Philadelphia,—T. Stork, who stood loyal to the General Synod for years,—F. W. Conrad, editor, and a preacher of unusual power,—John G. Morris, the nestor of Lutheranism for many years in Baltimore,—E. J. Wolf, preacher and professor,—Henry L. Baugher, a man who stood for the truth, a guide for years to Sunday-School teachers,—Chas. S. Albert, preacher, Home Missionary, and Sunday-School teacher,—J. W. Richard, scholar and historian,—G. F. Stelling, preacher and pastor,—John G. Goettman, an earnest advocate of the General Synod,—H. W. McKnight, preacher, pastor, President of Pennsylvania College,—Samuel Sprecher, a prince among men,—Ezra Keller, devoted to his work and his works do follow him,—M. W. Hamma, generous, and devoted to the institution at Wittenburg,—George Diehl, S. A. Ort, Reuben Fink, Reuben Weiser, Prof. Stoevers, a layman, a teacher, the biographer of many preachers.

May the great heads of the Church, whom these men served and followed, strengthen and guide the United Lutheran Church that the coming of the kingdom may be hastened.

These are some of the honored names, which with many others deserve a place in the records of the General Synod at its centenary.

These are the names of men who have made possible the centenary of the General Synod. They stood steadily for the pure Gospel as confessed by American Lutheran-

ism, and their names and deeds deserve to be held in grateful remembrance.

At the end of a century the General Synod stands not at the parting of the ways, but at the uniting of the ways. Its road has met other roads which others have been traveling. Three roads now merge into one, but the work of the General Synod abides, and its founders and faithful laborers will not be forgotten.

*Baltimore, Md.*

## ARTICLE VIII.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

The World War naturally dominates all life to-day. The Church is making a new appraisal of itself and its duty to the age. While the non-religious writers underestimate and depreciate Christianity, the real disciples of our Lord are absolutely confident that the War confirms and emphasizes the divine character and need of the Church. And surely the Church is rising grandly to the pressing necessities created by the war in the realm of morals and religion. When the Lutheran Church was recently asked for a free-will offering of three-quarters of a million dollars for its specific work among soldiers and sailors, the response was most enthusiastic and a million and a quarter were immediately pledged. Perhaps of all the extraordinary events of the war none is comparable to the sweeping changes which are taking place in the ancient Greek Church in Russia. Within the age-long static condition of apparently lifeless formality, there is after all a deep religious feeling, which seems about to break its bondage.

The Young Men's Christian Association has justified its existence during the war as never before. It has done much good in practically all the camps of friend and foe. Its good works have won the heart of the exclusive orthodox Russian Church. The General Secretary, John R. Mott, in an article in the *Methodist Review* (Jan.-Feb.) on "Recent Religious Developments in Russia," speaks of the marvelous changes taking place. During his visit to Russia in 1917 as a member of a Special Diplomatic Mission, appointed by President Wilson, he was welcomed to great Church assemblies and invited to address them. At a great convention, called the Sorbor, made up of over a thousand delegates, the first of its kind held in over

two-hundred years, he spoke, through an interpreter, for an hour. "At least a score of times during the address the entire audience arose, this being a sign of most signal approval."

The following is the first paragraph of Mr. Mott's admirable article:

The attention of the world has been so much absorbed with the political and social revolution in Russia that comparatively little has been said regarding what is in some respects equally remarkable—the wonderful religious changes now in progress in the country, especially in relation to the Russian Orthodox Church. The High Procurator of the Holy Synod told me just before I left Russia that greater and more significant changes had taken place in the preceding month than in the past two hundred years. He insisted, and the facts would seem to support him, that these changes have amounted to nothing less than a revolution. In the first place, religious tolerance has at last been achieved in Russia. All religions now stand on an equality. Men everywhere are free to worship God according to their own convictions and forms. They are also at liberty to organize their own religious associations, and to conduct their work without restriction. Even the Jews now have equal rights before the law and an end has come to the long tragedy of persecutions, humiliations and massacres. The attitude of any Christian nation toward the Jews is among the most searching tests of the character of its freedom. Many other sects for generations most severely oppressed have come out into the larger life and liberty.

---

"The Place of Prayer" in carrying on Foreign Mission work is emphasized by Mother Edith O. M. S. E., in an article in *The International Review of Missions*:

I want to plead very earnestly that a different solution of the problem may be considered. May not we missionaries of Anglo-Saxon race have been going rather by the way of our natural inclinations than by God's way, multi-

plying good works in the mission field, running admirable schools, hospitals and other institutions, but leaving, and so many missionaries themselves are not lamenting, very little time for prayer in the lives of those who carry them on; letting things secondary crowd out things primary, and through our own activities leaving very little room and time for the work of God the Holy Spirit? There seems little room for doubt that the question as to whether so much time for prayer is essential finds its answer here, and that the difficulty Dr. Flemming states may be really directly due to the very different proportion of time given to prayer in the lives of most modern missionaries from that which we know was given to it in the lives of our Lord Himself and His first apostles; a thing which necessarily affects not only their own ways of work, but the lives and outlook and spiritual development of their people. Speaking generally, is it not true that we missionaries as a rule establish many not directly spiritual works on lines that are altogether western, and then find our people unable to take them over from us; while at the same time we have taken up all their time and thought with these works of ours, instead of leading them to give more time to that direct intercourse with God which might result in the Holy Spirit's leading them forward, according to God's plan for them, on lines of development such as never occurred to us to aim at? With us as their guides they are not generally likely to give more time to prayer than we do; but until there is more time for prayer in our own lives and those of our people, are they not almost bound to become still more ineffective replicas of us, while we ourselves reproduce as yet so little of the fullness of Christ.

---

The *Lutheran Church Review* prints a "Reformation Sermon at Harvard University," preached by Dr. Haas, of Muhlenberg College. The formal principle of the Reformation is finely set forth as follows:

The authority of the Word of God is the authority of Jesus. The Word leads to Jesus, and Jesus rules through

the Word. Every real and honest human word is part and parcel of the person that utters it. When speech is not idle talk, it is life of our life, begotten of our intellect, nurtured by our emotions, and developed and confirmed by our will. Much more is it true that the divine Word is the living energy and truth of Jesus. It was His Spirit and wisdom who testified through men called to be prophets in days of old, before His coming. It is His Spirit who preserves and vivifies Him since His resurrection through His own words and through those of the apostles. All the words of Christ are spirit and life.

This centralization of the Word of God in Christ is the very core of the message of the Reformation. Luther measured all Scriptures by the standard of Christ. He dared to judge all books of the Bible by the criterion whether they testified of Christ. He says, "It is Jesus' work and power alone where the Gospel, faith and the true Church remain in the world, and He puts His Word into the mouth and the heart so that it is preached and accepted." "Christ exercises no other power over against the world than only that of the Word of God." It is necessary in order that we might have Jesus directly and vitally to have the Word of God. We can never truly search the Scriptures without finding the Christ, and without the Christ we do not have that which is really the Word of God. Says Luther, "Who does not have this man, justly and purely, who is called Jesus Christ, God's Son, whom we Christians preach, and who will not have Him, such a man should let the Bible alone. This is my advice. He surely will be offended and the more he studies the more he will become blind and perverted, whether he be Jew, Tartar, Turk, Christian, or whoever he boasts himself to be." Christ is the norm by which the Reformation judges the Word. It is not concerned with any historical or scientific standard, but only with the religious value and power of the Word of God, which is inherent in Jesus Christ.

---

In the same number of the *Lutheran Review* Dr. Whit-



teker, of Lancaster, in writing about "The Merger that Lasts," uses the following pertinent language in reference to the projected union of several Lutheran bodies:

In principle, we are one; in practice, our name is legion. The poles are far apart—with ice at both ends! There are radical men here, and rabid men there. There is stately liturgical usage one place, and a go-as-you-please practice some other place. There is the all inclusive spirit in some districts, and the all exclusive spirit in other districts. There may even be points of practice in which no two men think exactly alike. And then, the personal equation comes more or less into evidence. Can such bodies merge? Can the several parts be welded together at some ecclesiastical forge? Or, can they be so baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire, that they become fused into a unit which knows no parts? It not only can be done; it must be done, or the "Merger" will be a flat failure!

And how shall it be done? By the spirit of patience. We must endure each other's mode of thought and speech and act, until the moulding power of the Holy Ghost has wrought the miracle of grace that shall make us one in heart and life. We must cultivate, on all three sides, that spirit of love which "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." The whole movement must be Christo-centric, with the love of God to guide it. And the closer we get to Christ in the fellowship of love, the closer shall we get to each other in everything that is Christlike. One with Him, we shall, through Him, be one—and at one—among ourselves.

---

Dr. Preserved Smith in *Bibliotheca Sacra* in a discussion of "The Reformation," summarizes Luther's services as follows:

1. He introduced various practical reforms, as in education and poor relief.
2. By sharply questioning the ancient and almost unanimously held religion of Western Europe, he made the masses think for themselves, and thus introduced a

powerful solvent of the "cake of custom" not only in religion but in all departments of life.

3. He broke the monopoly, which had too often proved the tyranny, of the mediaeval ecclesiastical state. Even in Catholic lands the Church was never able again to assert its former supremacy.

4. By declaring all laymen priests he made all priests simple laymen and thus abolished a privileged class.

5. By preaching the excellence of the humblest Christian and the equality of all before the divine majesty, he sowed the seed, which, on proper soil, was destined to bring forth the demand for popular rights.

6. For a primitive, sacramental religion he substituted a new type of piety more in harmony with the ethical and philosophical ideals of the age.

7. By asserting for himself the right of private judgment he introduced a new spirit into Christianity, one inevitably bound to evolve in time complete religious individualism and complete religious liberty.

8. By shattering the ascetic ideal of the Church he restored to this world energies previously dedicated to the next, and gave an immense stimulus to the forces making for wealth and social improvement.

---

The Rev. Richard Roberts in an article on "Retrospect and Anticipation, 1517-1917," in *The Hibbert Journal*, looks upon the present crisis as the close of the Protestant Reformation period, from which will emerge a new Reformation.

New wars or a new religious synthesis—these seem to be the alternatives before us. We may take some comfort from the fact that the coming change has begun in Russia, a land where the religious impulse is still vital and powerful; and there is some evidence that behind the swift overturn of the old order was the energy of an enlarged social vision informed and quickened by a profound religious faith—a faith, here as elsewhere, owing little to the official Church, fostered and nurtured in humble and obscure by-ways. It is not without its sig-

nificance that Russia has produced in Lyof Tolstoi—with all his defects and limitations—the greatest religious figure of our age; and Dostoievsky, in whom the essential Russian spirit becomes more clearly vocal than in perhaps any other writer describes the Russian destiny as that “of revealing to the world her own Russian Christ, whom as yet the people know not.” “There lies, I believe,” (he goes on) “in the inmost essence of our vast impending contribution to civilization whereby we shall awaken the European peoples; there lies the inmost core of our exuberant and intense existence that is to be.” Perhaps, when the clouds have passed, we shall see behind the New Russia a new energizing vision of Christ, of “Christ in the other man,” a redeeming, recreating perception of that ultimate social unity which we sometimes call the Kingdom of God, but which is also the Kingdom of man,

Who knows that 1917, which is in one sense the end of the historical period of which the Reformation was the starting-point, may not be the birth-time of the principle of the new Reformation? The age that is passing has been great and memorable in the achievement of freedom; perhaps its death-agonies are the birth-pangs of another principle of life, without which freedom can never be perfect. The Rights of Man are not to be fully realized except as they are seen to be the rights of the other man. The banner of the old order bore the splendid word, Freedom; the banner of the new shall bear the twin legend Freedom and Fellowship. And perhaps the Church may be redeemed by the gift of a new prophetic word, a new evangelism which will call men to bind their brethren to themselves in a living comradeship—where there is neither Jew nor Gook, neither bond nor free—with the same passion, the same urgency as in times past it has called them to flee from the wrath to come.

---

The World War brings to the test all religious, social and economic doctrine. The question of non-resistance is prominent. Dr. Benj. W. Bacon writes of “Christ and

the Pacifist" in the *Yale Review* (Jan.) as follows:

Taken in the mechanical, legalistic sense to which the disciples are prone, it is possible to make of the precept of forbearance a rule or doctrine of non-resistance. Yet in practical application this doctrine would promote the precise opposite of that spirit of service and devotion which is the vital breath of our religion. For it belongs to the very nature of the system of domination and slavery to cultivate arrogance in the oppressor and servility in the oppressed. To the slave there is no higher law than non-resistance, till in some happy turn of fate the slave himself become oppressor and vent his pent-up spite in brutality towards the weak. Far as the study of mankind looks back, this is the notorious tendency of systems of autocracy.

But non-resistance is not the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. Its teaching is in substance: "Avenge not yourselves, but overcome evil with good"; and its example is the God who, in the exercise of goodness and wisdom alike, though he frustrates with almighty power the designs of wickedness, yet wins by his forbearance every sinful heart that can so be won. Even the noble example of a Tolstoi cannot blind us to the fact that the Sermon teaches no doctrine of a non-resistant God. It commends forbearance. It upholds the example of the forgiving God. But in all things it would have us "seek first his kingdom and his righteousness." For that ideal it is well to turn again the smitten cheek. And for that ideal it is also well in the evil day to put on the whole armor of God and to withstand, to fight and bleed, to resist as the God of righteousness resists, to die as the Christ has died.

---

What does the Sun stood still mean? is asked and answered in *The Princeton Theological Review* by Prof. Robert Dick Wilson. He says in part:

It will be perceived that the translation suggested does away with the miraculous character of the event in so far as it involves the solar system and the law of gravitation.

It is true, also, that it runs counter to Jewish exegesis and to all the ancient versions, except perhaps the Greek, which is somewhat ambiguous and difficult of explanation. Notwithstanding this, I confess to a feeling of relief, as far as I myself am concerned, that I shall no longer feel myself forced by a strict exegesis to believe that the Scriptures teach that there actually occurred a miracle involving so tremendous a reversal of all the laws of gravitation. It can readily be understood how the Jewish interpreters of later times, either through ignorance, or because of their overwhelming desire to magnify their own importance in the scheme of the universe, should have embraced the opportunity that the ambiguous terms of this purely scientific account afforded them to enhance the magnitude of the divine interference in their behalf. But for us to-day there lies in this passage the more useful lesson of faith in God as the answer of prayer. How stupendous was the faith of Joshua as shown in his prayer! How immediate and complete was God's answer to that prayer! He who knew beforehand what Joshua would ask, had made all preparations to grant his request. For His are hearts and stars, and darkness and light, and faith and love and victory, excelling in their lasting glory all the transient miracles of standing suns. Lastly, mark that the inspired writer says that it was the extraordinary answer to the prayer of a man that made that day at Gibeon to be unlike every other day before or since. In following his interpretation of its significance, let us rest content.

I would suggest the following translation:

"Be eclipsed, O sun, in Gibeon,  
And thou moon in the valley of Ajalon!

And the sun was eclipsed and the moon turned back, while the nation was avenged on its enemies. Is it not written upon the book of Jashar?

And the sun stayed in the half of the heavens,  
And set hastily as when a day is done.

And there never was a day like that before or since, in  
respect to Jehovah's hearing the voice of man."

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE IX.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. NEW YORK.

*The Holy Trinity*, A Study of the Self-revelation of God, by Louis George Mylne, M.A., D.D., Rector of Alve Church, Worcestershire, same time Bishop of Bombay. Cloth. 6 x 9. Pp. x, 286. Price \$2.50 net.

The handsome exterior and fine press-work of Dr. Mylne's treatise on the Trinity are a fit setting for its profound thought. His purpose is to clarify the doctrine of the Holy Trinity without, of course, professing to dispel its mystery. He believes that the belief in the Trinity is not chiefly of theological value, but pre-eminently of value to devotion and to practical life. "On the devotional side our whole conception of the character of God, of the love which He claims at our hands just for what He is in Himself gains a new and higher meaning from belief in His subsisting from eternity as very Love itself, not in a solitary Majesty of power, unloving and unloved." The idea of trinity in unity embraces the possibility of a real love in its essence and its expression. It suggests the social side of the eternal life of God.

Mediation and Atonement become real and possible only in a Trinity, where the Mediator is one with the Godhead, for whatever the mystery the Christian has the "assurance that in the Person of Christ there passed between Two Beings, each wholly Divine in Himself, yet each inseparable from the other, the offering on one side, the acceptance on the other, of that which effected once for all a new *status* for man towards his Maker."

The deity of Christ is our assurance of salvation. His sacrifice, we feel, must have endless virtue. We rest in Him as our Daysman. His example is our inspiration. He is to us the perfect revelation of God. Without Christ we cannot know God.

The author expounds at length the teachings of the Gospels and the Epistles showing that they unmistakably set forth the doctrine of the Trinity. The utterances of our Lord Himself, recorded in the fourth Gospel, can alone account for the Christology of the Epistles.

The Creeds of the Church are next examined with a



view to show how they are the formulation of the Trinitarian doctrine as experienced in the consciousness of the Church Catholic as over against the errors of heretics.

The doctrine of the Spirit is briefly treated, but without any uncertainty. At the threshold of the New Testament Church we find that Another has taken Christ's place. The Inspiring Spirit is the mediating Agent between Christ in Heaven and His Church on earth. The Holy Ghost receives due honor in the Creeds. In reference to the Procession of the Spirit, the author says that the Eastern Church is not at variance with the Western essentially in believing that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *through* the Son.

The philosophical bearings of the doctrine of the Trinity are declared to be most vital. The author believes that materialism, pantheism and other false philosophies receive their strongest refutation in the fact of the Trinity in which the Personality of God is vindicated.

Occasionally the author falls into a questionable statement. For instance, he says: "While believing in essential Equality of Nature as belonging to all Three Persons, we are forced by the thought of Derivation of Being and by that of Act or Function into acknowledging Subordination of Persons as compatible with Unity of Nature." p. 218. It is evident enough that in Function, for the sake of human redemption, Christ emptied Himself. He could thus truly say, "The Father is greater than I" in perfect consistency with "I and the Father are one." If by "Derivation of Being" the author means to convey the idea that the Son and the Spirit derive their Being from the Father in any timely or earthly sense, he has vitiated his entire argument. The begetting and the procession are eternal, and they express relation rather than process. Love in its everlasting out-going is the attribute of Father, Son and Spirit, co-equal and co-eternal.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CHARLES SCRIBNERS SONS. NEW YORK.

*Introduction to the New Testament.* By Theodor Zahn, Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Erlangen University. Translated from the third German edition by a group of Fellows and Scholars of Hartford Theological Seminary under the direction of Dr. Melanch-

thon W. Jacobus, assisted by Charles Snow Thayer. Three volumes in one. Second Edition revised. Cloth. 8mo. Pp. xx, 556, 617, 487.

This is a remarkable issue of a remarkable work. Within the compass of 8vo. size, with the thickness of only an inch and a half and a weight of less than two pounds, there are nearly seventeen hundred pages of good readable print. The type of the main argument is large, while that of the notes following the several sections is smaller but clear. All this is made possible by the use of thin but opaque paper. The price is exceedingly low, considering the size and the character of the book. The publishers deserve much praise for the enterprise which has put a most valuable work within the reach of all interested.

Dr. Zahn, a venerable professor at Erlangen, stands in the front rank of Bible scholars. He is a prolific author with a wide range of works in sacred literature, especially pertaining to the canon. He is recognized as the leading conservative in New Testament criticism. His profound learning, historic spirit, analytic and synthetic skill, judicial temper and living faith have made him a safe guide through the wilderness of criticism which too often has been hostile to the Bible as the Book of God.

We are, therefore, grateful for the present low-priced edition of his *Introduction* which makes accessible the treasures of Dr. Zahn's learning. Before accepting the conclusions which appear in many cyclopedias, commentaries and brief introductions to Bibles, we would advise theologians and pastors to consult Zahn.

The *Introduction* deals with all the books of the New Testament. After some illuminating remarks concerning the language of the New Testament, Dr. Zahn takes up the study of the Epistle of James as the oldest of the New Testament books, written in the year A. D., 50. Then follows the consideration in turn of the Epistles of Paul, Peter and Jude, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and finally the writings of John. The general method of treatment embraces the careful study of language, circumstances, personality, occasion, purpose, integrity, genuineness and history as they may bear upon the matter in hand. While the treatment is necessarily critical and technical, it is by no means dry or obscure. A wealth of information concerning persons, places and the meaning of texts illuminates the discussion.

The general result may be stated to be the vindication of the authenticity and the genuineness of all the books of the New Testament canon. Reliable Christian scholars have long since accepted the canon, with the exception of Second Peter, concerning which more or less doubt has existed since the second century. Professor Chase in *Hasting's Bible Dictionary*, issued in 1902, still maintains that this epistle is non-canonical.

Dr. Zahn seems to establish beyond controversy the right of Second Peter to the place which it occupies. His theory, supported by apparently impregnable argument, is that Second Peter antedates First Peter by two years, and the Epistle of Jude by about thirteen. He holds that the so-called Second Epistle is really the First and that it was addressed to Jewish Christians and the other to Gentile Christians. This reconstruction of theories seems to relieve the doubt as to the character of this Epistle.

We may be grateful that in the formation of the canon no unworthy book has been included and as far as we know no worthy book has been excluded. No doubt many apostolic letters have been lost, and it is barely possible that some may be recovered; but it is doubtful whether any additions to the canon could make the way of salvation more plain than it is now. We may look upon the Bible as having been formed, transmitted and preserved under the superintendence of the all-wise and loving God, who therein has made a gracious revelation of Himself and His purposes concerning mankind.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

*The Record of a Quaker Conscience.* Cyrus Pringle's Diary, Introduction by Rufus M. Jones. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 93. Price 60 cts.

Cyrus Pringle, a Vermont Quaker, was drafted during our Civil War. On account of conscientious scruples he refused to render the services required and suffered punishment in several camps. After repeated appeals he was finally released through the special interposition of Lincoln. Friend Pringle kept a diary of the events and inner experiences involved. The recital is interesting, whether or not one agrees with the position taken, which was so extreme that he refused to perform *any* service

even in the hospitals. In the present war a favorite and commendable service which the Friends are rendering is in rebuilding villages in France. They have gone wherever they could—to Belgium, to France, to Russia, to Italy, to Serbia and Greece and Syria and Mesopotamia—to carry into operation the forces of restoration and of reconstruction.

In the Introduction is presented the attitude of Lincoln on the non-resistance of the Friends. He seems to have sympathized with them and interposed in their behalf. During the Civil War earnest Friends would visit the President and pray with and for him. He was greatly strengthened by these interviews and acknowledged the benefit received in several characteristic letters reproduced by Professor Jones.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

KEYSTONE PUBLISHING HOUSE. BLAIRSVILLE, PA.

*Jesus on His Second Coming, A Handbook of Eschatology, the Lord's Return, the Resurrection and the Judgment.* By Rev. W. Roy Goff, S.T.B. Pp. 99. Price: Paper, 25 cts.; Cloth, 50 cts.

The laudable purpose of the author is to present "a consistent Biblical view" of the Lord's Return, the Resurrection and the Judgment. His conclusions are that the Lord's Return took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D., 70, and that there will be no second advent as usually held. The Resurrection of the dead takes place at death, when the earthly house is put off and the heavenly house put on. The Judgment is a continuous process, going on now, and there will be no general judgment at the end of the world, for men are all judged as they die and there will be no end of the world. These are in brief the ideas set forth.

Convinced of the soundness of his views the author declares that "truth demands that changes be made in the phraseology of some Church rituals, articles of faith, collects, creeds and hymns, where reference is made to eschatological subjects. They were written by men who had wrong conceptions of these subjects." The author's conclusions, therefore, are not to be regarded as tentative, but absolutely final, and are to be carried into the worship and practice of the Church. Accordingly "The wording of the service of the Lord's Supper" should no longer retain the words "*till he come*, for this evidently

was a purely local item, meant only for the Apostolic Corinthian Church from the time written until about A. D. 70, when that Church would be raptured along with other saints." The Apostles' Creed should also be amended by changing "resurrection of the body" into "resurrection of the dead." From the burial service must be eliminated the expression, "looking for the general resurrection in the last day" because there will be no resurrection and no last day. Hymns and songs and Sunday School lesson helps must all be brought into conformity with the ideas set forth by the author.

If these ideas were entirely new they might be passed by, at least until there were evidences that the age-long faith of the Church was being disturbed by an innovation. The author, however, modestly disclaims any originality, giving credit for these doctrines to an esteemed and able teacher, the late Dr. M. S. Terry, of the Garrett Biblical Institute. Similar views were propounded by the late Dr. W. N. Clarke, who very frankly discredits Paul, and sets forth doctrines which seemed to him to be more rational than those taught in the Bible. Indeed, I suspect that the seeds of Mr. Goff's theories are nearly as old as Christianity itself, for Paul admonishes Timothy (2 Tim. 2:18) to "shun profane babblings; for they will proceed further in ungodliness, and their word will eat as doth a gangrene; of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; men who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some." This quotation is made for its historic testimony and not to cast any reflections on the author of the book under review. Peter (ii Peter 3) speaks of mockers who should arise "in the last days" and tauntingly say, Where is the promise of his coming? The content evidently indicates Peter's belief in the final second coming of Christ, and a final judgment.

The arguments relied on by Mr. Goff are based partly on alleged dates and partly on the exegesis of certain texts. It is stated in the Preface that the Gospel, Epistles and Revelation of John must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70. But of this there is absolutely no evidence. Dr. Zahn, of Erlangen, the ablest living conservative critic, fixes the date of the Gospel and the Epistles at 80-90, and of Revelation at about 95. With these dates there is common agreement. Dr. Terry himself says that the Gospel of John was written sometime after the fall of Jerusalem. (Biblical Dogmatics, p. 451).

It is impossible within the limits of this review to take up in detail the exegetical argument. A single instance must suffice. At the Ascension of our Lord, the angels declared, "This Jesus who was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld Him going into heaven." Acts 1:11. This passage is chosen because the author believes that the English translation has been the greatest cause of the modern and erroneous teaching of a visible coming of Christ. The author's objection to the translation refers to the words "in like manner as" (Greek, *on tropon*), which he holds should have been translated "as" or "even as," for this is the way in which these words are translated in four other passages: Matt. 23:37; Lk. 13:34; 2 Tim. 3:8; and Acts 7:28. In reply to this it should be said that the translators both of the old and the new version deliberately translated the words "in like manner as," because that is the proper way to translate the Greek word *tropos*. It means *manner* and in all the passages cited it might have been rendered *manner*. The word *tropos* is used only thirteen times in the New Testament and has the connotation of *way* or *manner*. The usual words for "as" are *hos* or *kathos* and are used over four hundred times. Luke in using the word *tropos* evidently intended to convey the idea of *manner*.

The doctrine of the Second Advent may be constructed at least in part from the text under consideration. The *fact* of Christ's return is clearly affirmed; and the *manner* is indicated to be *visible*, and *glorious*.

The whole subject of eschatology is confessedly difficult. With our limited knowledge concerning the future, it becomes us to speak with reserve concerning events which have not been revealed in detail. The general outline of a consistent doctrine, however, seems to emerge from the various passages in the New Testament. The Church through these nineteen centuries has been looking for the appearing of its Lord. This passionate longing has at times been out of symmetry with well-balanced expectation, and has betrayed some of its advocates into fanaticism. The highly colored prophecies have often no doubt been misunderstood; but, as Haering says, "Through all the pictures and colors which the New Testament employs there can be no doubt about the main point; the second coming is an actual unmistakable, unambiguous revelation for believers and unbelievers." (*The Christian Faith* ii, 901). Haering further says (p. 909), "The hope of the return of the Lord forms part of

the lively hope of the Christian; and the neglect of it is a sign of faith that is becoming faint."

After a thorough and critical inquiry into the perplexities surrounding the Second Advent, the late Dr. George B. Stevens, refused to accept the easy explanation that the parousia is a process or dispensation. He says, "Christ's whole conception of the Kingdom of God implies the idea of its consummation, of which He might naturally speak as a special, final self-manifestation, or parousia. Nor does it seem to me that we could reasonably explain the prominent place which the expectation of the second advent had in the mind of the early Church if Jesus had been wholly silent on the subject. That it should have been over-emphasized, that it should have been regarded as near at hand and surrounded by external signs and wonders, can be historically explained; but that it was created *ex nihilo* is an assumption which would require for its justification something more than an argument derived from the difficulty of finding a clear and consistent explanation of the perplexities connected with the passages in question." (*Theology of the New Testament*," p. 160f.)

We have confined our criticisms principally to the Second Advent, because its doctrinal determination involves the doctrine of the resurrection and the judgment.

To our mind the author of the book under review has failed to grasp the difference between *process* and *crisis*. There is no doubt that the coming of our Lord and the judgment are both progressive and final. The mingling of the nearer and farther views of temporary and final comings need cause no confusion or doubt. That is the manner of prophecy, as the Messianic passages of the Old Testament testify.

The allusions to a "last day" and the "parousia" are too numerous and too important to be relegated to the subordinate place given them by the author. On so vital a matter the scholarship and the consciousness of the Church are not likely to be mistaken. Moreover, the whole idea of Christ's mediatorial work and kingdom seem to demand some finality, some settlement and consummation.

Let us continue to confess our faith in Jesus Christ, who rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty, from whence He will come to judge the quick and the dead.

J. A. SINGMASTER.



THE ABINGDON PRESS. NEW YORK.

*The Master Quest.* By Will Scranton Woodhull. Cloth Pp. 186. Price 75 cents net.

The restless spirit of man finds rest only in God. In this readable, beautiful little book the author talks about the terribleness of sin and its sovereign remedy as revealed in the Bible. Our Lord from heaven, the Man from Nazareth comes to us, takes our place and shows us the way. The author accepts the great fundamental truths of our holy religion and expresses them in the simple language of literature and experience rather than of theology. His style is glowing and his thought is enriched by appropriate quotations. *The Master Quest* is a good book to place in the hands of those whose faith needs quickening.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Call to Arms.* A Manual for Men Preparing for the National Army Camps, prepared by Arthur H. Brown and Frank Wade Smith. Paper. Size 3 3-4 x 5 inches. Pp. 126. Price 10 cents net.

This is a book of practical information and directions for men going into the army. It contains President Wilson's Address to the Soldiers and chapters on the Draft, Preparing for Camp, Camp, Why We Fight and How We Fight. An appendix contains the Soldier's Oath, the Conscription Act, a list of America's Wars, Books worth Reading, &c.

This wholesome booklet ought to have a large circulation.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Confessions of a Browning Lover.* By John Walker Powell. 8vo. Cloth. Price \$1.00 net.

The author believes that it is worth while for one more witness "to attest the unfailing stimulus, the deep spiritual satisfaction which he finds in Browning above all other English poets." He treats of Browning as an artist and as a philosopher. His account of Browning's relation to the problem of evil and of his optimistic outlook upon life is especially interesting. He finds that "with such a faith a man can afford to keep under his body and bring it into subjection to the higher ends of thought and feeling. He can be content with a small

measure of what men call success and achievement, laying up for himself treasures where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt. He can be sick and poor and friendless and yet possess a wealth greater than the treasures of India, because he lives in the eternal universe as a son in his Father's house. He can love with all the strength of his soul, and see his loved ones laid in the ground, and look forward to the day when for him as well the worms will be slipping in and out between his fingers, and his heart will not break, because he looks for a city that hath foundations, whose maker and builder is God."

Doctor Powell's work is a valuable addition to the great library of Browning books.

E. S. L.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. NEW YORK.

*The Consciousness of Jesus.* By Horace M. Du Bose. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 144. Price net, 75 cents.

The keynote of this little volume is sounded in the sentence (p. 32), "It is too much the habit with even orthodox critics and scholars to lay stress upon the simplicity of the gospel narrative, and the absence from it of metaphysical statements and implication."

The effort of Dr. Du Bose is to emphasize the profound truth of the divine-human cosmic consciousness of our Lord and His "immanence" in the Word. What is presented here as comparatively new has always been the teaching of Lutheran theology. Christ in His two natures, inseparably united in one Person, is an ever present Christ in the world and in the Word, apprehended, however, only by the believer.

The volume is highly suggestive but too metaphysical to interest the average reader.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Book of Revelation Not a Mystery.* By David Keppel. Cloth. 12mo. Pp. 76. Price 50 cents net.

The Book of Revelation is generally regarded as very mysterious and quite inexplicable, owing to the fact that it is written in figurative language and deals with matters out of the usual experience. Mr. Keppel declares that the book is not a mystery when interpreted in the light of history. He claims that "like all other prophetic books, the Apocalypse is mainly concerned with events

occurring in its own age." "Passing over the events alluded to in the Letters to the Churches as being in no wise mysterious, we regard the body of the book, from the close of the third chapter to that of the eighteenth, as almost entirely devoted to things which took place in Palestine in the life time of Saint John." "Babylon" is not Rome as usually interpreted, but Jerusalem. The thousand years during which Satan was bound represents the period in the life of the Roman Empire when there was a cessation of persecutions on a great scale. The last things are yet to come and the predictions in Revelation concerning them correspond with our Lord's own prophecies.

The author seems to substantiate his claims by historical citations. His treatment is entirely rational and well worth attention. His theories are not new but deserve the credit of clear and concise statement. We recommend that pastors purchase Mr. Keppel's work. It will probably clarify their views on a book that has perplexed many of them.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Letters on the Atonement.* By Raymond H. Huse. Introduction by Bishop Edwin H. Hughes. Cloth. Pp. 79. Price 50 cents net.

These "Letters" are supposedly addressed to a young lawyer who has some doubts concerning the Atonement. The manner of these communications is too flippant and the treatment of the subject too superficial to carry conviction. To justify this statement we quote part of the "summary."

1. "God is our Holy Father. This is the climax of all revelation through Christ. If there is a sense in which, as the theologians have taught us, the atonement must be a satisfaction to Him, it is the Holy Fatherhood which must be satisfied."

2. "As a Father, all the propitiation he will need to forgive his children is the assurance of their moral transformation. If he can be perfectly sure of the heart-deep truth of the statement, 'I won't do it again,' he won't fuss over the scales, but will eagerly open the front gate of his Father-heart!"

The propitiation was made once for all long ago. "The assurance of their moral transformation" is no ground for forgiveness, God needs no assurance. He knows everything.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

NORTHWESTERN PUBLISHING HOUSE. MILWAUKEE, WIS.

*Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte.* By J. P. Koehler, Professor in the Lutheran Theological Seminary of the Wisconsin Synod, in Wauwatosa, Wis. Pp. 770. Price \$3.50.

This is a book which we have read with growing respect for the ability of the author as a church historian. It is intended as a text-book for the theological seminary. What is new and particularly attractive, is this: (1) It presents Church History as a part of the world's history, particularly of the history of civilization (*Kulturgeschichte*), which is very commendable. Our theological students as a rule are deficient in general historical perspective. In pointing out the connections of cause and effect with regard to the two fields the author always carefully limits himself to what is most essential. What we have admired everywhere are his excellent judgments in brief statements. (2) It is a history that is up-to-date. Here we read of the administration of Socialism, which Milwaukee had a few years ago, of the bread riots in Petrograd, and of the lessons suggested by the great war; of the fellowship movement in Germany, of many recent union movements, of the modern evangelization endeavors (including "Billy" Sunday), of the laymen's movement, of the most recent history of the Lutheran Church in America.

What enables the author to hold himself within 725 pages in a general Church History of this kind (the most valuable Index covers 43 pages) is that throughout the book, even where he deals with the history of the Church in particular, he limits himself to brief historical statements and characterizations. The question suggests itself whether a book that does not tell a little more in detail of the developments in Church History is sufficient for the purposes of the theological seminary. For an English seminary this would be the defect of the book. Why is it that the brief compend of Church History by Kurtz, which in German has had near to twenty editions, has never been translated into English? Simply because it is not adapted to the reciting method as it has yet been mostly practiced in our English theological seminaries. In the English class room the teacher wants the student to prepare himself for the recitation by going over larger material. On the basis of such material questions are

asked, and the teacher, from the standpoint of a wider reading, and a more matured judgment, sums up, emphasizes and impresses the essentials. But Prof. Koehler wrote for the German class-room where the teacher by lectures, with interposed questions, adds to the brief and condensed material of the text-book. His book calls for a teacher who comes prepared to tell much more than is contained in the text.

The fine judgments which the reader finds almost on every page of this book and which will prove to be highly helpful to student and teacher alike indicate the author's ability as a church historian. He teaches his readers how to interpret Church History. It is this feature that makes the book especially interesting and makes it a valuable guide in all comparatively modern history.

That a book in its first edition, covering such a large field, can be improved goes without saying for the one who knows anything of the difficulties in the way of writing, on this side of the Atlantic, a text-book on Church History. Kurtz spent the most part of his life in correcting and improving his text-book. May we be permitted to point to a few matters that, among others, may be corrected in a following edition? It can hardly be maintained anymore, after the investigations of Prof. von Schubert in his book "*Bekenntnisbildung und Religionspolitik*," pp. 280ff., that the Schwabach Articles were written after the Marburg Articles (p. 376). According to Coelestine (in Seckendorf, *Commentarius Historicus*, etc., II, 170) it was not Dr. Brueck, but Dr. Beyer who read the German copy of the Lutheran Confession at Augsburg (p. 379). It is correct that Luther at first opposed the Smalcald Federation (p. 391), but later he defended the attitude of his elector toward the emperor, and he declared the question a matter for the jurists to decide. (Luther's Works, Erl. Ed. 25, 1ff.; 113ff. *Enders Briefwechsel* 8, 344). We are not justified in saying that the Confession of the German Evangelical Synod of America is that of the Prussian Union (p. 665). The Church of the Prussian Union is confederative in character (since 1843) while the Evangelical Synod of our country represents an absorptive union. This difference is also brought out in the confessional obligation of the two sides. That there is a similarity of features between the two can, of course, not be denied. These are just a few things that our eye caught in reading.

But while the correcting hand of the author, in following editions, many find things to improve we have here a Church History of exceptional value, and since the writer

of this review is interested in the creation of text-books for our English Lutheran seminaries he would suggest that Prof. Koehler give us a text-book for Church History in English. The need of such a work is felt. With all appreciation of contributions from non-Lutheran quarters we do feel that in a branch of theology like Church History our students should be led to look at developments in the Church from a Lutheran standpoint. However, as to a mere translation of Prof. Koehler's book we would have our doubts. The book should be adapted to the needs of the English class-room as we have indicated above. It should be a work of two volumes and be made a guide for a course in Church History of two years. For such work the English Lutheran Church of our country would be grateful.

J. L. NEVE.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Christliche Dogmatik.* By Franz Pieper, D.D. Vol. II, Pp. 672. Price \$4.00.

Here Dr. Pieper, the successor of Dr. Walther in the chair of Systematic Theology in the Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, Mo., offers us one volume of a work on Dogmatics, that is to be complete in three volumes. It is a work that has been anxiously awaited by many for a number of years. The second volume appears first for certain reasons, the third is to follow immediately, and Vol. I will appear last.

Dr. Walther's theology rested upon two pillars, the *sola scriptura* and the *sola gratia*, and Dr. Pieper, in constructing the work of his teacher, never leaves out of view these fundamentals. It is, however, the second of these that receives special attention in the volume before us. It treats of saving grace, of Christ's person and work, of faith, of the origin of faith and of justification by faith. But it is the whole manner in which the author makes use of Scripture, which shows his strict adherence also to the first principle. In his Foreword Dr. Pieper insists that only with the Scriptures as the *principium cognoscendi* can the dogmatician be really modern and up-to-date since the Bible alone is fundamental for all time; and that by ignoring this source and by turning to the Christian consciousness or to Christian experience he places himself in a position where he knows nothing (1 Tim. 6:3-4).

A large part of this volume, pp. 56 to 461, is devoted to the discussion of Christology for two reasons, as Dr. Pieper states: (1) Because modern liberalism and even modern positive theologians have abandoned the enhypostasy of Christ's human nature; and (2) because the Lutheran Church of America lives among the Reformed Churches whose dogmaticians (Charles Hodge and William Shedd, as instances) have treated Lutheran Christology, as expressed in the Formula of Concord, with severe criticism. Dr. Pieper now follows such criticisms in all their ways and tries to show that they are unscriptural and even inconsistent from the standpoint of the Reformed Church. The discussion in this large section reveals a thorough study of all the Confessions of the Reformation time in connection with the writings of the theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as also a wide reading in the literature of the schools that have followed Schliermacher, up to the modern positive school represented by Ihmels and others.

Then follows, pp. 473 to 760, the eminently practical and timely treatment of the application of the grace of Christ: Saving faith, what it is, how it is enkindled in the individual *at the moment* of conversion; the efficient cause of conversion, the means through which it is wrought, its psychology; the meaning of continued conversion and the conversion of those that have fallen from grace. A special and very interesting chapter deals with the synonyma of conversion. A large section of the book is devoted to answering the objections of Pelagianism, Semipelagianism and Synergism. Not all Lutherans will agree that what Dr. Pieper calls Synergism is in reality such. As should be expected in a work of Dogmatics, there is in this volume no spirit of wild polemics; all is quiet and dignified development. The star by which the author is guided is the *sola gratia*, and his aim is to eliminate every vestige of Synergism from the order of salvation, and his practical interest is to teach his readers to preach a gospel of grace that is in no sense dependent upon man's conduct. Man is not converted because he gives up his willful resistance. Even such admission, Dr. Pieper says, would carry merit into conversion, would make salvation dependent upon human conduct, and so destroy the *sola gratia*. In order to exclude all and every Synergism conversion is to be taken as occurring in a moment, the moment when the Holy Spirit enkindles faith in the spiritually dead man; no preparatory stages involving an already existing spiritual life are to be ad-



mitted. Whatever spiritual movements there are in man before this moment of conversion are no evidences of a spiritual life residing in him, but merely influences from the outside, which the Holy Spirit brings to bear upon him. Conversion as a gradual process would open the avenues for Synergism and legalism. Dr. Pieper differs from many in what is to be regarded as real conversion: the presence of just a spark of faith shows that conversion has taken place. With this teaching there goes through the book a strong emphasis not only upon objective atonement, but also upon the objective conception of justification.

Dr. Pieper guards himself carefully against real Calvinism. While he teaches, as we have seen, that conversion is not effected because man gives up his willful resistance, but merely because of the influence of grace upon him, yet he insists that men are lost merely because of their rejection of God's grace, and not because of an eternal decree. The contradiction which here appears indicates where the mystery in election is to be sought, Dr. Pieper says. On this point there should be compared with this position a most searching article by Dr. F. W. Stellhorn in the February issue of "Zeitblaetter and Magazine." (Luth. Book Concern, Columbus, O.) Yet Dr. Pieper's position is essentially different from that of Calvinism. The universality of grace is taught with much stress. He rejects a doctrine of special election that is not auxiliary to the doctrine of universal grace in Christ and through the means of grace (cf. p. 498). God did not first decree in an absolute way who shall be saved and then, in order to carry out such decree, send Christ and the Gospel. Here it is characteristic that Dr. Pieper treats the doctrine of election in the last volume of his work, immediately before eschatology. This is certainly different from the method of Hodge who deals with election in the first of his three volumes, before creation. This *a posteriori* arrangement of Dr. Pieper, together with the emphasis upon universal grace, shows that he means to treat election as a doctrine of comfort for those in doubt as to the surety of their salvation.

While reading this volume of Dr. Pieper the question came to us again and again whether the insistence upon so many sharp distinctions which are all meant as a *conditio sine qua non* of church fellowship does not throw into the Lutheran Church an intellectualism from which there is bound to be a reaction such as followed upon the work

of the seventeenth century theologians. According to voices from the Synodical Conference such reaction is noticeable already in a decided weariness of discussing certain doctrinal problems that used to hold the rapt attention of many in the intersynodical conferences and in the discussions in "Lehre und Wehre." Whether it is to be held that there are no movements of spiritual life in man before the moment of conversion, or whether such are indeed traceable ought not to make such a difference that the one calls the other a Pelagian and the other his opponent a Calvinist. With all due respect for the passages of Scripture that are quoted we ask whether this psychological problem is intended to be entirely cleared up by the Word of God. The Norwegian Lutherans have united on a basis recognizing the legitimacy of both types in the teaching of election, with proper qualifications; and the German Lutherans, in their practical pastors and laymen, are longing for a union on a similar basis. We refer to the conciliatory tone of the polemics, to the recent suggestion of Dr. Hein of the Joint Synod to unite with the Synodical Conference over the heads of the theologians, and to the intersynodical conferences that are held here and there.

In closing our review we want to call attention to the very clear and simple style of Dr. Pieper's volume, which makes it possible for every one with a fair reading knowledge of the German to get the thought. It is a work that will be much studied. There are frequent references to Dr. Keyser's book on "Election and Conversion," and Dr. Pieper makes the remark (p. 598) that this book, with which he does not agree, does not deserve to be disregarded as to ability in dealing with the question.

J. L. NEVE.

CHRISTIAN ALLIANCE PUBLISHING CO. NEW YORK.

*Outline Studies in Christian Doctrine.* By George P. Pardington, B.D., Ph.D. Cloth. Pp. 364.

The late Dr. Pardington was a teacher of Bible students, ministers and missionaries. His system of Christian Doctrine grew out of his teaching. In the Introduction Dr. A. B. Simpson says of this volume that "the spiritual quality will be found predominant, and perhaps every other feature it will be recognized not so much as a system of theology as a system of Christology."

The positions taken are conservative throughout from the Baptist point of view. Very little is said of baptism, however. In general the book may be said to be a reproduction of the theology of Augustus H. Strong, of the Rochester Seminary.

Dr. Pardington was a pre-millenarian, and taught that "Jerusalem shall become a world center and David's Greater Son shall rule not only over His own patrimony, but shall be Suzerain over the whole earth."

The treatment of the several topics is very brief and dogmatic. As an Outline it serves its purpose well.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

WARTBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE. CHICAGO, ILL.

*The Life of Dr. Martin Luther*, Sketched for Young People's Societies and the Necessary Directions for General Discussions Appended,. By Prof Dr. M. Reu, translated by Emil H. Rausch. Flexible Cloth. 5 x 6 1/2. Pp. 210. Thin paper. Price 35 cents.

This little volume serves the purpose for which it was compiled. Every section concludes with questions covering the matter. Dr. Reu's well-known ability guarantees the accuracy of the text.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN. ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

*My Church*, An Illustrated Lutheran Manual, Pertaining principally to the History, Work, and Spirit of the Augustana Synod. Vol. III. Edited by Rev. Ira O. Nothstein. Silk Cloth. Pp. 123. Price 60 cents net. Art Cover 25 cents.

This beautiful book with its good paper and numerous illustrations has among the purposes of its publication the fostering of the history of the Swedish Lutheran Church among its young people. It is made up of sketches of the early struggles and present status of the great Augustana Synod, with its splendid institutions and missions at home and abroad.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Cross and the Crescent.* By Margarete Lenk. In the Service of the Prince of Peace. By Margaret Lenk. Translated from the German by A. W. Kjellstrand. 8vo. Pp. 126 and 136. Boards. Illustrated. Price, single copies 30 cents; in dozen lots, 25 cents net; fifty copies, 22½ cents net.

These little stories serve to present in a form suited to the minds of boys and girls of twelve to fourteen three interesting periods. The scene of "Swanwit," the first of the two series in "In the Service of the Prince of Peace" is laid in Thuringia at the time when the first glimmerings of gospel light were beginning to shine in the dark forest. In "Wolfgang and Ermentraut" the background is the Peasants' War of the sixteenth century. "The Cross and Crescent" is a story of the children's crusade. Both books are valuable additions to the list of literature suitable for Sunday School libraries.

*Stories for Children.* By Zach. Topelius. 8vo. Illustrated. Pp. 132. Boards. Price 25 cents.

The Scandinavians are rich in fairy lore. These tales are of the variety that children wish to hear again and again.

E. S. L.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA, PA.  
*The Schoolmaster and His Son*, A Narrative of the Thirty Years War. By K. H. Gaspari. Translated from the third edition of the original German. 8vo. Pp. 216. Boards. Price.

This pathetic and tragic story is founded upon facts revealed by authentic letters and documents. Its hero is a prodigal son who returns to his father's house to die after having redeemed some of the evil which he had done by bravery as a soldier. The book is illustrated by Jessie Gillespie.

E. S. L.

*The Three Kings.* By Gustav Nieritz. Translated from the German by Rebecca H. Schively. 8vo. Pp. 223. Boards. Price.

This story, entertainingly told, represents the king Balthasar as a German who under the direction of a pious Jew journeyed to the East so that his daughter might be

healed by bathing in the holy waters of Jordan or of the pool of Bethesda, and who finds the Christ Child. It is meant for a somewhat younger generation than "The Schoolmaster and His Son." Both stories were printed by the Lutheran Publication Society some years ago and are now reprinted in a new and attractive form.

E. S. L.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

*Luther's Picture* in Sepia print by Kroening, with German or English inscription of a verse of Luther's Hymn. Price postpaid 35 cents. Size 6 x 9.

This is a fine piece of work, The portrait and the finish are excellent.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

ERNST MUSSGANG. ST. PAUL, MINN.

*Tyndale's New Testament.* The truth about the so-called Luther's Testament in English. By L. Franklin Gruber. Paper. Pp. 71. Price 35 cents postpaid.

*Documentary Sketch of the Reformation.* By L. Franklin Gruber. Paper. Pp. 47. Price 30 cents prepaid.

The above valuable brochures are re-prints from the *Lutheran Review* and deal with their respective subjects in a scholarly way. The former shows Tyndale's dependence on Luther's translation. The latter gives a historical account of the more important Reformation documents, together with brief bibliographical notes.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

